

Will L. Brown,
 Horace S. Craigin,
 William R. Lightbody,
 Arthur A. Neubauer,
 Robert E. Cleary,
 Raymond D. Fear,
 Maurice A. Aaronson,
 Harry J. Vaughan,
 Arthur L. Gaetani,
 Bruno J. W. Glaubitz,
 Raymond R. Simmons,
 Gordon S. Allyn,
 Thomas H. Cherry,
 Lewis G. Avery,
 William W. Davies,
 Andrew J. Hedgcock,
 Maurice Jose,
 Fred N. Pugsley,
 James B. Latimer,
 John H. Morrissey,
 Floyd W. Rice,
 Ellis M. Spoon,
 Ardmore A. Stott,
 Samuel S. Watkins,
 Thomas F. Duldge,
 Lloyd A. Kennell,
 Conrad O. Rogné,
 Ronald B. Rogers,
 Corydon M. Ryon,
 Bernard J. O'Neill,
 Fred H. Gebhardt,
 Joseph F. Rowe,
 John C. Lindsay,
 John R. Lynch,
 Edward D. Lette,
 Cope M. Blackford,
 Fred C. Smith,
 James O. Walker,
 Jesse C. Horton,
 Thomas C. Little,
 Solomon Schneider,
 Edwin Janss,
 Isaac N. Ratchford,
 Charles C. Richards,
 Claude D. Roop,
 Arthur Van Dusen,
 Camille M. Shaar,
 Benjamin W. Gaines,
 Thomas G. McDonald,
 Ian D. Tiedmann,
 Milton H. Schutz,
 Howard T. Child,
 Robert A. Schless,
 William F. Broadhead,
 Edward L. Lingeman,
 Samuel Cline,
 James D. Benjamin,
 Hugh F. Lena,
 Jules Magnette,
 Reuben G. McCall,
 William K. Otis,
 Edward D. Archibald,
 Enoch G. Brian,
 Charles R. Hughes,
 Harry E. Kleinschmidt,
 Fred A. Rieckhoff,
 Craig Worth,
 Emmett J. Brady,
 Fremont Cummins,
 Harry A. Keener, and
 Edward J. Cummings.

Pay Clerk Ransom C. Wall to be an assistant paymaster in the Navy with the rank of ensign, for temporary service, from the 1st day of January, 1918.

The following-named citizens to be acting chaplains in the Navy with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), for temporary service, from the 15th day of May, 1918:

Robert H. Blackshear, citizen of Georgia,
 Joseph A. Perkins, citizen of Illinois,
 William P. Reagor, citizen of Kentucky, and
 Reuben W. Shrum, citizen of New Jersey.

John F. B. Carruthers, citizen of the District of Columbia, to be an acting chaplain in the Navy with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), for temporary service, from the 16th day of May, 1918.

Frank Halford, assistant quartermaster in the Marine Corps with the rank of major, to be major in the Marine Corps from the 20th day of August, 1916.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 3, 1918.

REGISTER OF LAND OFFICE.

Vene Bloomer to be register of the land office at El Centro, Cal.

POSTMASTERS.

MASSACHUSETTS.

Myra G. Jordan, West Upton.

MISSISSIPPI.

Ansel W. Quin, Columbia.

WYOMING.

Herbert M. Brown, Sundance.

Florence S. Heitz, Superior.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, June 3, 1918.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father in Heaven, help us to concentrate all our energy and strength, physically, mentally, morally, upon the prosecution of the damnable war which has been forced upon us with a faith that makes for patience, a hope that makes for confidence, a patriotism that makes for sacrifice, a courage that makes for endurance, that we may do and dare, fight and pray.

For right is right, since God is God;
 And right the day must win;
 To doubt would be disloyalty,
 To falter would be sin.

In the name of right we pray. In the name of humanity we pray. In the name of Christ we pray. In the name of God we pray. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, May 31, 1918, was read and approved.

DEPARTMENT EMPLOYEES LIABLE TO MILITARY SERVICE.

Mr. MADDEN and Mr. KING rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] rise?

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of privileged resolutions which I send to the Clerk's desk. There are a number of them, perfected in accordance with the understanding of a day or two ago.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first one.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 372.

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Navy be requested to report to the House of Representatives the number of men in the service of the Navy Department between the ages of 21 and 31 years for whom requests for exemption from military duty or deferred classification have been made and allowed by such department, the name and home address of each such person, and the character of work he is performing in the service of the department, and the length of time he has been in such service.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. MADDEN. We had those things up on Friday, and it was understood—

Mr. RAYBURN. It seems to me from the reading of the resolution that the gentleman is asking for something the department can not give. He asks for the number of exemptions asked and the number allowed by that department. That department or any other department has no right to allow exemptions.

Mr. MADDEN. They asked somebody else to allow them.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be again reported.

Mr. MADDEN. This resolution has been reported in accordance with the understanding of the House on Friday.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will again report the resolution. The resolution was again reported.

Mr. MADDEN. That is, "asked by the department and allowed."

Mr. RAYBURN. It says "asked and allowed" by the department. The department has no power whatever to allow an exemption.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask to have it corrected.
The SPEAKER. How does the gentleman wish it corrected?
Mr. MADDEN. To have it read "asked by the department and allowed." Have each one of them read in that way.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Speaker—
The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?
Mr. DOWELL. Will the gentleman yield for a question?
Mr. MADDEN. Yes.
Mr. DOWELL. Is there any deferred classification?
Mr. MADDEN. This asks for deferred classification.
Mr. DOWELL. Asks for deferred classification also?
Mr. MADDEN. Yes.
Mr. DOWELL. I did not understand that.
The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. STAFFORD. May we have it reported as it would read as amended?

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it again. This makes the third time.

Mr. STAFFORD. It has not been reported as amended by the gentleman from Illinois.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the resolution as proposed to be amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Navy be requested to report to the House of Representatives the number of men in the service of the Navy Department between the ages of 21 and 31 years for whom requests for exemption from military duty or deferred classification have been asked by such department and allowed, the name and home address of each such person, and the character of work he is performing in the service of the department and the length of time he has been in such service.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution as amended.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Massachusetts rise?

Mr. WALSH. That does not convey the impression the gentleman seeks by his amendment.

Mr. MADDEN. It says "asked by the department and allowed." I suggested it be changed.

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman from Illinois, Mr. Speaker, asked to strike out the words "by such department," as I understand it.

Mr. MADDEN. Everybody here asked to have it changed Friday, and it was changed to meet everybody's views.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Waldorf, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 2374. An act to relieve the estate of Thomas H. Hall, deceased, late postmaster at Panacea, Fla., and the bondsmen of said Thomas H. Hall of the payment of money alleged to have been misappropriated by a clerk in said office.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendment the bill (H. R. 9864) to amend section 111 of the Judicial Code, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendments the bill (H. R. 10852) to provide for the appointment of a commission to standardize screw threads, had requested a conference with the House of Representatives, and had appointed Mr. KENYON, Mr. HARDING, and Mr. SHIELDS as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed the following order:

Ordered, That Mr. NUGENT be appointed an additional conferee on the part of the Senate on the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 4482) to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the establishment of a Bureau of War-Risk Insurance in the Treasury Department," approved September 2, 1914, as amended.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. Sharkey, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had approved and signed bill and joint resolution of the following titles:

On May 31, 1918:

S. J. Res. 152. Joint resolution to prevent rent profiteering in the District of Columbia.

On June 1, 1918:

H. R. 8764. An act to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the admission of the State of Illinois into the Union.

SENATE BILL REFERRED.

Under clause 2, Rule XXIV, Senate bill of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to its appropriate committee, as indicated below:

S. 2374. An act to relieve the estate of Thomas H. Hall, deceased, late postmaster at Panacea, Fla., and the bondsmen of said Thomas H. Hall, of the payment of money alleged to have been misappropriated by a clerk in said office; to the Committee on Claims.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?
Mr. KING. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the subject of agricultural or farm-risk insurance.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject of agricultural and farm-risk insurance. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

DEPARTMENT EMPLOYEES LIABLE TO MILITARY SERVICE.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report this resolution as modified:

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 372.

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Navy be requested to report to the House of Representatives the number of men in the service of the Navy Department between the ages of 21 and 31 years for whom requests for exemption from military duty or deferred classification have been asked by such department and allowed, the name and home address of each such person and the character of work he is performing in the service of the department and the length of time he has been in such service.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment: After the word "years" insert "July 1, 1917."

Mr. MADDEN. Oh, no. Well, all right. The gentleman can offer it.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

Mr. RAKER. After the word "years" insert the words "July 1, 1917."

Mr. MADDEN. Between 21 and 31 on July 1?

Mr. RAKER. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. I accept the amendment.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the amendment will be agreed to.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution as amended.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

Mr. MADDEN. Now, Mr. Speaker, I ask that the other resolutions in the hands of the Clerk be amended in accordance with the amendment of this one.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks that the other 10 resolutions be amended in the same way that that one was.

Mr. FOSTER. They are going to be read?

The SPEAKER. Yes. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next one with that language in.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 377.

Resolved, That the Attorney General be requested to report to the House of Representatives the number of men in the service of the Department of Justice between the ages of 21 and 31 years July 1, 1917, for whom requests for exemption from military duty or deferred classification have been asked by such department and allowed, the name and home address of each such person and the character of work he is performing in the service of the department and the length of time he has been in such service.

Mr. WALSH rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Massachusetts rise?

Mr. WALSH. I want to direct the attention of the gentleman from Illinois to the fact that I think that the amendment of the gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER] nullifies the effect of the resolution. It simply calls for the names of those who were in the service of the department on July 1, 1917, between the ages of 21 and 31.

Mr. MADDEN. That is not what we want.

Mr. WALSH. If you will read the resolution, you will find that that is what you will get.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the amendment is to get those who are in the service 21 years of age.

Mr. WALSH. Putting the language in where he does, he confines the information to the number of men who were of that age in the service July 1, 1917.

Mr. RAKER. I think not.

Mr. MADDEN. We do not want to do that.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution again.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Attorney General be requested to report to the House of Representatives the number of men in the service of the Department of Justice between the ages of 21 and 31 years July 1, 1917, for whom requests for exemption from military duty or deferred classification have been asked by such department and allowed, the name and home address of each such person and the character of work he is performing in the service of the department and the length of time he has been in such service.

Mr. MADDEN. I am afraid that that does exactly what the gentleman from Massachusetts says it does, and I hope the amendment will not be adopted. I move to strike it out of the other resolution now.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois moves—

Mr. MADDEN. I move to reconsider.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois moves to reconsider the action of the House in passing the resolution about the Navy Department. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MADDEN. I move to strike the amendment out.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois moves to strike out the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

Mr. DOWELL. No; Mr. Speaker, that is not in order.

Mr. MADDEN. It is in order. We are reconsidering it.

Mr. DOWELL. The proper way is to reconsider the vote whereby the amendment was adopted.

The SPEAKER. That is what we have done.

Mr. DOWELL. He is making a motion to strike out.

The SPEAKER. He is making the motion to strike out now.

Mr. DOWELL. The proper motion is to reconsider the question.

The SPEAKER. The Chair knows; but the motion to reconsider has already passed.

Mr. DOWELL. I understand; but the motion should be to reconsider the vote whereby the amendment was adopted, and not by striking it out. We have reconsidered the vote, but we ought now to reconsider the vote whereby the amendment was adopted and refuse to adopt the amendment.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, the question reverts on the motion of the gentleman from California without any motion to reconsider or anything else. We have reconsidered the vote whereby we passed the resolution, and now the question reverts to the motion of the gentleman from California.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from New Jersey rise?

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. My proposition is that if you put in the words "who were between the ages of 21 and 31" on that day you will have no trouble about the resolution. I move to insert "who were."

Mr. DOWELL. There was a motion made to reconsider the vote which adopted the resolution. That was carried.

The SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. DOWELL. Now, when we had the resolution here the amendment of the gentleman from California was adopted. That now stands as adopted by the House. The question now should be to reconsider the vote whereby that amendment was adopted. Then we have brought it back to the question of voting on the amendment, but until the vote by which the amendment was adopted is reconsidered you can not consider any other question with reference to that amendment. The vote should now be to reconsider the vote whereby the amendment to the resolution was adopted.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I make that motion.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois moves to reconsider the vote whereby the amendment of the gentleman from California was adopted. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MADDEN. I move the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. RAKER rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from California rise?

Mr. RAKER. To get unanimous consent to speak for a minute or two minutes before the next resolution is taken up.

Mr. MADDEN. We have a lot of them.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois controls the time.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. DOWELL. The question now recurs on the adoption of the amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Chair understands that just as well as the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. DOWELL. The gentleman was moving the adoption of the resolution when I raised the question.

Mr. RAKER. Will the gentleman allow me a minute?

Mr. MADDEN. Oh, we shall not get anywhere with this matter if you do that.

Mr. RAKER. There is a resolution here to try to get information. But you will not get the names of all of these men who are over 30 years of age under this resolution. Since the date the law went into effect there have been hundreds who have passed the age of 30 years, and you ought to get all of those who are in that service that are over 30 years of age. That is what we want in the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

The amendment was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. DOWELL rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I desire to make an inquiry of the gentleman from Illinois.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. DOWELL. Would it not cover this case to provide for the names of those within the draft age, as provided by law?

Mr. MADDEN. A point of order was made and sustained against that language on Friday last.

Mr. DOWELL. It would seem to me that by unanimous consent that ought to be inserted.

Mr. WALSH. The draft age is specified here by giving the ages.

Mr. DOWELL. There could be no question about it if the resolution said "of draft age," and that would include those that have gone beyond 31 years of age.

Mr. MADDEN. The use of that language on last Friday was objected to on a point of order, and the point of order was sustained.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

NEGRO SOLDIERS.

Mr. CHANDLER of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD a booklet entitled "A Tribute for the Negro Soldier," by John E. Bruce, a distinguished author and the American representative of the African Times and Oriental Review, London, England.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an article on the colored soldier. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT EMPLOYEES LIABLE TO MILITARY SERVICE.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, there is another resolution, which I call up.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 371.

Resolved, That the Secretary of War be requested to report to the House of Representatives the number of men in the service of the Department of War between the ages of 21 and 31 years for whom requests for exemption from military duty or deferred classification have been made and allowed by such department; the name and home address of each such person, and the character of work he is performing in the service of the department, and the length of time he has been in such service.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Illinois yield to me for a moment.

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I do not know that it is important, but I venture to direct the gentleman's attention to the amendment offered by our friend from California [Mr. RAKER], and suggest that such an amendment, not in the language offered, but somewhat modified, ought to be adopted, so as to include those who on June 5, the day of registration, are of that age, and I suggest that for this reason: There might be someone in the service who would not come within the terms of the resolution as the gentleman now provides. I do not like to take up the time of the House, but I can see where this situation might arise. When the Secretary of War sends down that information, if he sends it literally, according to the terms of the resolution, he would probably exclude from it—

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I have not the floor.

Mr. MADDEN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GARNER. Does not the gentleman from Tennessee believe that a Cabinet officer would interpret this language according to its intent, to ascertain the number of men subject to draft who have been excused on account of service in the Government. If I thought that a member of the Cabinet would construe it any other way, I would certainly insist that it be drawn with more accuracy, but I can not conceive that a member of the Cabinet would undertake to excuse himself from not sending the information that evidently this resolution is intended to bring forth.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Here is the point, let me say in answer to the gentleman from Texas. We know what we have in our minds, but if we do not say what we have in our minds in the resolution as we pass it, how is the Secretary of War to construe the resolution other than by its terms? So far as its terms are concerned, it says those who are in the service who are between the ages of 21 and 31 years at this time, and it does not say between the ages of 21 and 31 on the 5th of June last. That is the way I would put it, in order to avoid any possibility of misunderstanding between the department and the Congress, and in order to avoid any criticism that might arise in the future. I venture to bring that to the attention of the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MADDEN. I suggest to the gentleman that he offer such an amendment, and I would yield for that purpose.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I suggest an amendment to insert the words "on the 5th of June, 1917, or who became 21 years of age thereafter," and that would include all of them.

Mr. RAKER. I want to make this suggestion to the gentleman, that if, after the word "war" you would insert the words "who were on June 5, 1917, between the ages of 21 and 31," it would answer the purpose.

Mr. DOWELL. And who became 21 years of age.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I am not yielding the floor for this purpose.

Mr. RAKER. I know what the gentleman wants to get at, and that is all of the men who are liable to service, but you leave out of the resolution all of the men who went into the service between June 5 and the present date, and there will be no record of that, and we ought to have a record of all of those men.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, I want to suggest to the gentleman from Illinois that he temporarily withdraw his resolution until he can get time to put it in shape.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee to offer an amendment.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee: After the word "war," insert the words "who were on June 5, 1917," so that the resolution will read:

"House resolution 371.

"Resolved, That the Secretary of War be requested to report to the House of Representatives the number of men in the service of the Department of War who were, on June 5, 1917, between the ages of 21 and 31 years, for whom requests for exemption from military duty or deferred classification have been asked by such department and allowed; the name and home address of each such person, and the character of work he is performing in the service of the department, and the length of time he has been in such service."

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, I accept that amendment. It is perfectly agreeable to me and is exactly what I want to reach.

The SPEAKER. The question is on ordering the previous question on the amendment and the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT].

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk be authorized to insert those words in each of the other resolutions, including the one that has been passed.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to insert the words of the amendment of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] in all of these resolutions that are to be offered and also in those that have already been passed. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 383.

Resolved, That the United States Shipping Board be requested to report to the House of Representatives the number of men in the service of that board who were, on June 5, 1917, between the ages of

21 and 31 years, for whom requests for exemption from military duty or deferred classification have been asked by such board and allowed; the name and home address of each such person, and the character of work he is performing in the service of the department and the length of time he has been in such service.

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 377.

Resolved, That the Attorney General be requested to report to the House of Representatives the number of men in the service of the Department of Justice who were, on June 5, 1917, between the ages of 21 and 31 years, for whom requests for exemption from military duty or deferred classification have been asked by such department and allowed; the name and home address of each such person and the character of work he is performing in the service of the department and the length of time he has been in such service.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 15 minutes when these resolutions have been disposed of.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent to address the House for 15 minutes when these resolutions are disposed of. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MEEKER. I ask unanimous consent, following the gentleman from Michigan—

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, let us get through with these resolutions.

The SPEAKER. Certainly; but the gentleman from Missouri has a right to submit a request for unanimous consent.

Mr. GARNER. I ask for the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. MEEKER] is asking unanimous consent.

Mr. MEEKER. I ask unanimous consent that following the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY] I be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes on the result of the correspondence with the several nations of the world as to the status of alien soldiers.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks for 10 minutes following the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY] to talk about alien soldiers. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 378.

Resolved, That the Secretary of Labor be requested to report to the House of Representatives the number of men in the service of the Department of Labor who were, on June 5, 1917, between the ages of 21 and 31 years, for whom requests for exemption from military duty or deferred classification have been asked by such department and allowed, the name and home address of each such person, and the character of work he is performing in the service of the department and the length of time he has been in such service.

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 379.

Resolved, That the Secretary of Agriculture be requested to report to the House of Representatives the number of men in the service of the Department of Agriculture who were on June 5, 1917, between the ages of 21 and 31 years, for whom requests for exemption from military duty or deferred classification have been asked by such department and allowed, the name and home address of each such person, and the character of work he is performing in the service of the department, and the length of time he has been in such service.

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 380.

Resolved, That the Secretary of Commerce be requested to report to the House of Representatives the number of men in the service of the Department of Commerce who were on June 5, 1917, between the ages of 21 and 31 years for whom requests for exemption from military duty or deferred classification have been asked by such department and allowed, the name and home address of each such person, and the character of work he is performing in the service of the department, and the length of time he has been in such service.

Mr. McKENZIE. I should like to ask my colleague one question. If I understand the reading of these resolutions, this will only give us a line on the men who have been excused and who are now employed in the particular departments to which this inquiry is directed.

Mr. MADDEN. And in all the bureaus of each department.

Mr. McKENZIE. Now, if my colleague will permit one other question, will these resolutions reach a case where the head of a department has asked that the man be deferred on account of the necessity of having his services in the department, and after that has been done the man has been given a commission in either the Army or the Navy?

Mr. MADDEN. Then, if it does not do that, we will try and reach it.

Mr. McKENZIE. It ought to be reached.
 The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.
 The resolution was agreed to.
 The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next resolution.
 The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 381.

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Treasury be requested to report to the House of Representatives the number of men in the service of the Treasury Department who were on June 5, 1917, between the ages of 21 and 31 years for whom requests for exemption from military service or deferred classification have been asked by such department and allowed, the name and home address of each such person, and the character of work he is performing in the service of the department, and the length of time he has been in such service.

The resolution was agreed to.

House resolution 382.

Resolved, That the Interstate Commerce Commission be requested to report to the House of Representatives the number of men in the service of the Interstate Commerce Commission who were on June 5, 1917, between the ages of 21 and 31 years for whom requests for exemption from military duty or deferred classification have been asked by such commission and allowed, the name and home address of each such person, and the character of work he is performing in the service of the commission, and the length of time he has been in such service.

The resolution was agreed to.

House resolution 376.

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Interior be requested to report to the House of Representatives the number of men in the service of the Department of the Interior who were on June 5, 1917, between the ages of 21 and 31 years for whom requests for exemption from military duty or deferred classification have been asked by such department and allowed, the name and home address of each such person, and the character of work he is performing in the service of the department, and the length of time he has been in such service.

The resolution was agreed to.

House resolution 375.

Resolved, That the Postmaster General be requested to report to the House of Representatives the number of men in the service of the Post Office Department who were on June 5, 1917, between the ages of 21 and 31 years for whom requests for exemption from military duty or deferred classification have been asked by such department and allowed, the name and home address of each such person, and the character of work he is performing in the service of the department and the length of time he has been in such service.

The resolution was agreed to.

House resolution 374.

Resolved, That the Federal Trade Commission be requested to report to the House of Representatives the number of men in the service of that commission who were on June 5, 1917, between the ages of 21 and 31 years, for whom requests for exemption from military duty or deferred classification have been asked by such commission and allowed, the name and home address of each such person, and the character of work he is performing in the service of the commission, and the length of time he has been in such service.

The resolution was agreed to.

House resolution 373.

Resolved, That the Secretary of State be requested to report to the House of Representatives the number of men in the service of the Department of State who were on June 5, 1917, between the ages of 21 and 31 years for whom requests for exemption from military duty or deferred classification have been asked by such department and allowed, the name and home address of each such person and the character of work he is performing in the service of the department and the length of time he has been in such service.

The resolution was agreed to.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. WELTY, by unanimous consent, was given leave of absence for two weeks, on account of official business.

THE RED CROSS AND THE Y. M. C. A.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, I have a letter here which I am going to ask the Clerk to read, received by me on Saturday last from a young man, a lieutenant in the Engineer Corps, now in France. It is so interesting and complimentary to the Red Cross and the Y. M. C. A. that I thought the House would like to hear it.

The Clerk read as follows:

WITH THE COLORS,
 France, May 4, 1918.

Hon. J. W. FORDNEY,
 Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR FRIEND: Your most welcome letter came to me to-day, and I sure was glad to hear from you. Letters are letters in this country, and to get news from home certainly makes one feel fine.

I can not say much about what we are doing, but will tell you that we are doing some interesting work and are very busy all the time; and when I return to the States I will be able to tell you some interesting things that will interest you, too.

I am having a great time getting my tongue twisted into shape, but an Irishman was not made in a day, and you can not change him in a day, either.

I have seen some of the finest roads that are in existence anywhere; really they surpass most country roads in the States by 100 per cent; fine grades and permanent construction everywhere, but I guess that labor has been plentiful and cheap, so they could well afford it. Drainage is the solution of all road construction, either railroad or highway, and

they have well taken care of that. The railroads are rock ballasted because they have nothing else, but we have it over them on transportation and equipment, surpassing in every detail.

The country is not as level as it might be, and all the time that I spent studying about these great plateaus is thrown away, because the ground is like some of the ranches in the Palouse country in eastern Washington, where a rancher buys a ranch, stands it on edge, and farms both sides.

They talk in the States about this country being very immoral, but it is a mistake, because I believe they are better as a whole than the States along that line. They seem to be a clean, industrious people as far as they are personally concerned, but they have some peculiar ideas about taking care of their stock, that they all enter the same door and sleep under the same roof.

They can say what they want to about the Red Cross and the Y. M. C. A., but I will say that they are the "daddies" to us all over here, and a person that dares say a word against them should be shot at sunrise, and if cloudy should be shot in bed.

I am getting along dandy, feel fine, and am doing my bit every day and late at night, and any time that you can spare a moment to drop a line to an appreciative friend, then that's me; because I will be back some day, and I will go back in the old field again, and I do not want to forget or be forgotten in the lumber field at home.

Kindest regards to Mrs. Egerer and to your good family, and allow me to remain,

A sincere friend,

DAN MCGILLICUDDY.

Mr. FORDNEY. The boy goes further and gives a description of the forests and tells the kind of timber and flowers, and says it is a very beautiful country, quite like Paradise Valley in the Cascade Mountains. Paradise Valley is a valley at the foot of the great Rainier Mountain, in the State of Washington, with most magnificent scenery. I thought it would be of interest especially to those who have an interest in the Young Men's Christian Association and the Red Cross, because he states that they are doing such good work.

THE PROPOSED NEW REVENUE BILL.

Mr. FORDNEY. Gentlemen, the object of my few remarks this morning is in reference to the proposed new revenue bill. It is one of great importance to the people of the country, and I feel it timely for me to make a few remarks in reference to that bill, which it is proposed will raise \$3,000,000,000 in addition to existing laws.

I have and will continue, as every loyal citizen will, to vote for the necessary money for the Government to carry on this great war. I do not agree with some of my colleagues as to the proportion of our expenditures that we must raise by taxes. It has been repeatedly stated by the administration and by the Secretary of the Treasury, to me only a few days ago, that we are not raising by taxes in proportion to our expenditures the amount of money raised by Great Britain. In that the Secretary is in error. I am in receipt of a letter addressed to me by our American ambassador at London, England, dated April 25, which I have here in my possession. He gives the amount of money spent in Great Britain since the beginning of that war. He gives the amount raised by direct taxation, and gives it in great detail, and the amount of borrowed money. In order to be brief, let me say that up to the end of this fiscal year, March 31, 1918, that date being the end of Great Britain's fiscal year, Great Britain since the beginning of the war has raised £6,454,034,000, or \$31,408,585,000. Of that sum there has been raised in Great Britain by taxes \$7,871,000,000, or 25.06 per cent. That is, in round numbers 25 per cent of all expenditures in Great Britain from the beginning of the war until March 31, 1918, has been by taxation.

Mr. GARNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORDNEY. I will.

Mr. GARNER. Does that include the money loaned to the allies?

Mr. FORDNEY. I am not certain.

Mr. GARNER. I think that is the entire expenditure and includes the money loaned to the allies.

Mr. FORDNEY. Now, if it is true, so much the better for my side of the argument. Twenty-five per cent is all the money they are raising in Great Britain by taxes for their expenditures in this war. I have also obtained from our American consul at Ottawa, Canada, the amount of money that Canada is raising by taxes in proportion to her expenditures in this great war, and Canada has raised 18½ per cent by taxes. France has raised 11 per cent by taxes and borrowed 89 per cent. Italy has raised 9 per cent and borrowed 91 per cent.

Now, taking it for granted that our expenditures this year are far above the estimates made last year, which was \$12,000,000,000, the amount of money raised under existing revenue laws is going to exceed \$4,000,000,000, far exceeding the per cent raised by Great Britain in proportion to our expenditures. It is conceded by the Treasury Department that we will raise \$4,000,000,000, but I believe I am within bounds of correctness when I say that we will raise this year under existing laws in round numbers four and a half billion dollars from taxes. The Secretary of the Treasury stated to me one week ago that he

expected our expenditures this year, including our loans to the allies, would reach \$24,000,000,000; in round numbers that we would loan to our allies \$6,000,000,000. My good friend, Mr. KITCHIN, stated to me since that time that he understands that our loans will reach \$8,000,000,000 of this \$24,000,000,000 of our expenditures and our loans to our allies. I do not believe it is claimed by anybody that we should tax the people now for the money that we are loaning to the allies. We are selling bonds on which we are obtaining money to loan to the allies, and we expect our allies to pay the interest and the principal of those bonds when they come due, because their obligations to the Government of the United States fall due when our bonds come due on which we are borrowing this money. Therefore, my friends, I believe that the money we exact from the people at this time should be the proportion necessary for our own expenses of this war, not including our loans to the allies. I believe the President in his speech the other day, although I was not present, but I read it in the paper, fixed the total sum of our expenditures, including our loans, for the fiscal year of 1918-19, the next fiscal year, at \$20,000,000,000, \$4,000,000,000 below the sum stated to me by the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. MADDEN. If the gentleman will permit, the President did not submit figures in his statement.

Mr. FORDNEY. I saw that in the papers, and if it is not correct of course I stand corrected.

Mr. PADGETT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORDNEY. I will be glad to yield.

Mr. PADGETT. I simply want to make a statement that perhaps the Members would be interested in as rumors are going around. I have just talked with the Secretary of the Navy, and he said that to-day some German submarines appeared off the Jersey coast about 40 miles southeast of Barnegat and had sunk three schooners. We have not heard of others. He said they had gotten information that they had sunk three schooners about 40 miles southeast of Barnegat Light.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. The latest Associated Press report said that 14 vessels in all had been sunk, including one rather large vessel but quite a number of small vessels.

Mr. PADGETT. The Secretary stated the only definite information they had was that they had sunk three.

Mr. FORDNEY. I thank the gentleman; that is very interesting and startling information that makes the situation far more serious than up to date. Now, Great Britain's expenditures for the coming fiscal year, which this letter states had been sanctioned and agreed upon on the night before this letter was written, are a great increase over the three or four previous years. The amount of money to be raised by taxes this coming fiscal year, beginning the 1st of April in Great Britain, is \$4,097,000,000, a total budget of \$14,467,000,000 for the coming fiscal year. The amount of money to be raised by direct taxes of that total expenditure for this next fiscal year is 28.33 per cent. Now, my friends, it is claimed by the Secretary of the Treasury that we should raise at least 40 per cent of our expenditures this year, not including our loans to the allies.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORDNEY. If I can get a moment or so longer I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I would like the attention of the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee. The gentleman from Michigan has just stated that the Secretary of the Treasury has requested the raising of 40 per cent of our expenses by taxation, including loans to the allies—

Mr. FORDNEY. Not including loans to the allies.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Excluding loans to the allies.

Mr. FORDNEY. Exclusive of our loans to the allies.

Mr. LONGWORTH. That would bring the total amount of the proportion of taxes down to about 25 per cent, would it not?

Mr. FORDNEY. If we are expected by this new revenue measure which is contemplated to raise \$3,000,000,000 in addition to the amount to be raised under existing law we will raise some \$7,500,000,000 next year by taxes. Now, if that is but 40 per cent of our expenditures during the next year, then our expenditures, not including our loans to the allies, will be from \$18,000,000,000 to \$20,000,000,000.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Not according to the understanding that we had in the committee. I want to say, because I think this is an important matter, my understanding was that there was estimated about \$24,000,000,000, and that included about \$8,000,000,000 of loans to the allies.

Mr. KITCHIN. No; it included \$6,000,000,000, and I stated in my opinion it would be at least \$8,000,000,000.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I understood that \$8,000,000,000 was the amount estimated—\$6,000,000,000 already loaned and two more to come.

Mr. GARNER. It never has been more than \$500,000,000 a month.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Then the total amount, exclusive of the loans to the allies, was \$18,000,000,000?

Mr. GARNER. Yes.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman permit one question?

Mr. FORDNEY. I am going to ask for two or three minutes more, and I will yield now.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. The gentleman has read, or he himself has stated, that our ambassador in England put the amount which England has raised by taxation to meet her war expenditures 25 per cent, approximately, of the total.

Mr. FORDNEY. Up to the end of this fiscal year, and 28 per cent for the coming fiscal year.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. That is what I wanted to ask specifically. You made that 25 per cent. Does that mean the aggregate from the time the war began up to this time?

Mr. FORDNEY. The twenty-five per cent, my friend, that I mentioned includes the fiscal years of 1915-16, 1916-17, and 1917-18.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for five minutes longer.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? (After a pause.) The Chair hears none.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Following that question, the gentleman says that includes the end of the fiscal year 1917-18. Now, has England levied any higher taxes for the fiscal year which is to end in 1918-1919?

Mr. FORDNEY. England for the fiscal year 1918-19 has added increases all along the line—and if I had time I would read the amounts—additional taxes from the various kinds of revenue she is raising, and there are many of them.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman answer one more question? What tax now does England levy on excess profits and also on war profits?

Mr. FORDNEY. I do not know the exact percentage that she is taxing upon war profits and excess profits; but the amount is given here as excess taxes, \$2,588,978,000, not in detail; neither is the percentage of her total tax given. I have not the latest addition to the laws of Great Britain that give the amount of excess-profit taxes which they are levying by percentages, but I do not believe that is in the possession of our State Department, because I made inquiry for it and could not obtain it.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. The excess profits, and especially war profits, in this country, were the profits to which President Wilson specifically attracted attention the other day in his message.

Mr. REAVIS. Under the present revenue law in England, do they not raise 25 per cent of the cost of the war?

Mr. FORDNEY. No; 28 per cent for the next fiscal year; 25 per cent up to the end of this fiscal year is the average amount of taxes raised by Great Britain.

Mr. REAVIS. For the next fiscal year the gentleman states it will be 28 per cent?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. LONGWORTH. In the question of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER] I do not understand what distinction he makes between war profits and excess profits. England has no such taxes as we have. The only tax is war-profit tax, the difference between the profits before and during the war.

Mr. FORDNEY. Under the existing law England permits all her industries to make 10 per cent on the capital invested before imposing these taxes.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. There is a marked distinction between excess profits and war profits. A man in business may be making profits now very largely in excess of his antewar profits, and yet those may not come from anything in the way of manufacturing munitions and, therefore, are not war profits.

Mr. FORDNEY. It will be hard, my friend, for you and me to determine what is a war profit right now from the industries in this country. A farmer may be making large sums of money out of the products of his farm, we may say. Is it war profit or is it not? Take any industry, every industry, and what is the difference between an ordinary increase in profit and war profit? Now, let me go just a little further.

Mr. KITCHIN. Will the gentleman permit one question?

Mr. FORDNEY. I will.

Mr. KITCHIN. How much are the estimated expenditures of Great Britain for what we call her fiscal year, now?

Mr. FORDNEY. They are \$14,462,000,000 for the fiscal year of 1918-19, which has just begun, April 1. England's fiscal year ends March 31.

Now, gentlemen, I believe it is a common rule and a common practice of every country in the world during the time of war that some of the money raised to carry on a great war has been raised from increased import duties. I want to call your attention to our situation here.

The Wilson bill, about which the Republicans of this country made so much fuss during the 1896 campaign, carried an average ad valorem rate of 21½ per cent on imports. Of course, the matter of imposing a tax under that law as compared with the tax imposed upon imports in the Dingley law and in the Payne law were entirely different. Some articles were placed upon the free list that were later changed back to the protective list. But mark what I say: Twenty-one and one-half per cent was the ad valorem rate under the Wilson law. Twenty-five and one-half per cent was the ad valorem rate under the Dingley law. Eighteen and one-half per cent was the ad valorem rate under the Payne law.

Although the demagogues of the country said there were no reductions in the Payne tariff law, it was 3 per cent below the rates in the Wilson bill, about which the Republicans made so much fuss. But under existing law last year our ad valorem rates were 6 per cent, gentlemen—getting mighty closs to free trade. The last year of the Payne tariff law yielded to our Treasury \$333,000,000 in revenue on imports of \$1,812,000,000. Taking an average of the first nine months of this fiscal year and for the months of April, May, and June this year, which would complete this fiscal year, the average rate is 6.06 per cent under the Underwood tariff law, which will yield for the 12 months \$168,000,000 on imports in round numbers in values of \$2,800,000,000. Or \$165,000,000 less will be collected on imports this year under the Underwood tariff law than was collected under the Payne tariff law, with an increase of \$1,000,000,000 of imports this year.

I say to you the time has come, if we must raise more revenue to help carry on this war, when we should raise a greater portion of it from our import taxes.

Mr. GARNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes.

Mr. GARNER. The gentleman will recall when the last bill was made up the House carried a provision for an ad valorem increase, which was struck out in the Senate.

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes.

Mr. GARNER. Under the present conditions, with an embargo where you would have to have a license to import and export, does not the gentleman think it would be far-fetched to talk about levying any kind of duty at the customhouse?

Mr. FORDNEY. No; I do not, because it is the easiest tax in the world for the people to pay, because when they pay it they do not know it. There is where the Republicans have the advantage over you Democrats in imposing taxes upon the people. [Laughter.] Under existing law, if we had the Payne rates of duty in effect to-day, our imports would yield \$518,000,000 of revenue instead of \$168,000,000.

Mr. HENRY T. RAINEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes.

Mr. HENRY T. RAINEY. I thought the attitude of the gentleman always had been that the consumers do not pay the tax. The gentleman's attitude now is that they pay it, but do not know it. [Laughter.]

Mr. FORDNEY. No; I say that the consumer does pay it when the taxes are internal, and I will call your attention to why.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask for two minutes more.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FORDNEY. My friend, the difference between an internal tax and an import tax is this: Suppose you and I are engaged in the same line of business in this country, anything that we may be producing, no matter what it is. We add to our cost of production our taxes and insurance and all overhead expenses. Your tax is the same as mine on the internal tax, or war-profits tax, or the consumption tax, or any other kind of internal tax that is imposed upon the article that you and I are producing. We must add it to our cost, and your cost is the same as mine, and consequently we both add it to the cost, and the consumer must and does pay that added cost. There is no argument against that. Now, then, suppose you are engaged in producing an article abroad similar to an article that I am producing

here in the United States, and your raw material and labor cost is below my cost. My good friend, we must impose an import tax on your product; otherwise you will undersell me and put me out of business; and the minute you put me out of business, up goes the price, and you control the market; and under such circumstances the consumer then pays the tax, and none other. There is no comparison between an import tax and an internal-revenue tax. [Applause.] Mr. Speaker, I wish here to insert the letter and statistics received from our foreign embassy:

LONDON, April 25, 1918.

DEAR SIR: I am directed by the ambassador to acknowledge your letter of the 6th of April, asking him if he can advise you what portion of the cost of the war in England is raised by direct taxation and what portion is obtained from loans.

I find upon examination that in 1913-14 the revenue of the United Kingdom for the financial year was £198,243,000 and the expenditure £197,492,700. This will give you a rough idea of prewar revenue and expenditure.

For the financial year 1915-16 the revenue was £336,767,000; expenditure, £1,559,706,000; 1916-17 the revenue was £573,428,000; expenditure, £2,198,113,000; 1917-18 the revenue was £707,235,000; expenditure, £2,696,221,000.

The estimated revenue for 1918-19 is £842,050,000, of which £782,200,000 is to be obtained from taxes, and the estimated expenditure, £2,972,197,000; deficit, £2,130,147,000, as will be seen from the attached extract, to be obtained from loans.

I am, dear sir, your obedient servant,

BOYLSTON BEAL,
Special Attaché of Embassy.

The Hon. JOSEPH W. FORDNEY,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

THE COMING YEAR.

ESTIMATED REVENUE AND EXPENDITURE.

The following statement of revenue and expenditure for 1918-19 was issued as a white paper last night:

Estimated revenue, 1918-19.

Customs	£71,650,000	
Add proposed additional taxation	22,850,000	£94,500,000
Excise	35,350,000	
Add proposed additional taxation	17,850,000	53,200,000
		147,700,000
Estate, etc., duties		31,500,000
Stamps	8,500,000	
Add proposed additional taxation	750,000	9,250,000
Land tax		650,000
House duty		1,950,000
Income tax (including supertax)	267,500,000	
Add proposed additional taxation	22,950,000	290,450,000
Excess-profits duty, etc.		300,000,000
Land-value duties		700,000
		634,500,000
Total receipts from taxes		782,200,000
Postal service	24,600,000	
Add proposed increase in charges	3,400,000	28,000,000
Telegraph service		3,500,000
Telephone service		6,500,000
		38,000,000
Crown lands		650,000
Receipts from sundry loans, etc.		6,000,000
Miscellaneous		15,200,000
Total receipts from nontax revenue		59,850,000
Total revenue		842,050,000
Deficit		2,130,147,000
		2,972,197,000

Mr. MEEKER, Mr. HOLLAND, and Mr. SMALL rose.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. MEEKER] is entitled to 10 minutes. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HOLLAND] next. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. SMALL] now.

RIVER AND HARBOR BILL.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Speaker, I desire to submit for printing under the rule the conference report on the river and harbor bill.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 10069) making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The conference report will be printed under the rule.

Following are the conference report and accompanying statement:

CONFERENCE REPORT (NO. 615).

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10069) making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, and 11, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out the language in the proposed amendment; also strike out the period at the end of line 20, page 18, insert in lieu thereof a colon, and add the following words: "Provided, That in estimating the cost of doing the work by Government plant, including the cost of labor and materials, there shall also be taken into account proper charges for depreciation of plant and all supervising and overhead expenses and interest on the capital invested in the Government plant, but the rate of interest shall not exceed the maximum prevailing rate being paid by the United States on current issues of bonds or other evidences of indebtedness"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the language proposed insert the following:

"Sec. 5. That the Secretary of War shall cause an investigation to be made regarding the discharge or deposit into any of the navigable waterways of the United States of free acid or acid waste in any form or any other deleterious substances, and the extent to which the same exists and the sources thereof, together with any injurious results therefrom affecting the navigability of such waters or any works of improvement made thereon by the United States or any other uses of said navigable waters, and submit a report to Congress which shall include a summary of the evidence obtained and any recommendations regarding same which may be deemed appropriate, and any necessary expenses connected therewith shall be paid out of the available funds herein or hereafter appropriated for examinations, surveys, and contingencies. If in the course of such investigation it should be considered desirable to obtain any existing data or expert evidence or service from any of the other departments of the Government, the Secretary of War is hereby authorized to make application therefor, and such departments are hereby directed to furnish such data or evidence or service as may be so required and which may be considered pertinent or appropriate."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In the proposed amendment strike out the word "be" at the beginning of the twentieth line, and insert in lieu thereof the word "being"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference have been unable to agree on the amendments of the Senate numbered 1 and 2.

JNO. H. SMALL,
CHAS. F. BOOHER,
C. A. KENNEDY,

Managers on the part of the House.

DUNCAN U. FLETCHER,
JOS. E. RANSDELL,
KNUTE NELSON,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT.

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10069) making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes, submit the following written statement explaining the effect of the action agreed upon:

The rivers and harbors bill as it passed the House carried cash appropriations in the sum of \$21,427,900 and one continuing contract authorization in the sum of \$82,700. The amount added by amendment in the Senate was \$2,344,000 in cash appropriations, making the total of the bill as it passed the Senate \$23,771,900 in cash appropriations and a continuing contract authorization for \$82,700. As a result of the conference the amount involved in the Senate amendments has not been changed.

One amendment, however (No. 1), involving an increase of \$140,000, has not as yet been agreed to.

The following statement shows the action taken by the conference on each of the Senate amendments:

ACTION OF CONFERENCE.

On amendments Nos. 1 and 2, page 8: Mobile Harbor and Bar, Ala. Items increase amount appropriated in House bill for improvement work from \$200,000 to \$340,000. The committee of conference have been unable to agree.

On amendment No. 3, page 13: Fox River, Wis. Item eliminates language in House bill appropriating \$22,500 for maintenance and improvement work, and provides that the funds shall be applied to maintenance work only. House conferees recede.

On amendment No. 4, page 14: Los Angeles Harbor, Cal. Item adopts new project for the construction of a channel through the west basin into the southwestwardly arm to the site of a proposed large floating dry dock and appropriates the full estimated cost of said channel. House conferees recede.

On amendment No. 5, page 18: Section 4, providing that no contracts for river and harbor work shall be entered into hereafter if the contract price is more than 25 per cent in excess of the estimated cost of doing the work by Government plant. Item provides that overhead expenses, depreciation, and interest on capital invested, properly chargeable to such work, shall be taken into consideration in estimating the cost of executing the work by Government plant. House conferees recede with an amendment changing the phraseology, and specifically setting forth that the rate of interest charged on the cost of Government plant shall not exceed the maximum prevailing rate being paid by the United States on current issues of bonds or other evidences of indebtedness.

On amendment No. 6, page 18: Pollution of navigable waters of the United States. Item adds new section making it unlawful to discharge or deposit from any source whatever any free acid or acid waste in any form into any navigable water of the United States or into any tributary of any navigable water above tidewater, and provides penalties to be applied on conviction for violation of the provisions of this section. House conferees recede with an amendment striking out the proposed language and inserting in lieu thereof a section providing for an investigation by the War Department regarding the discharge or deposit into navigable streams of free acid, acid waste, or other deleterious matter, and to report to Congress the extent to which the same exists and the sources thereof together with any injurious results therefrom affecting the navigability of such waters or any works of improvement made thereon by the United States or any other uses of said navigable waters, such report to contain recommendations regarding same which may be deemed appropriate.

On amendments Nos. 7, 8, and 9, pages 19, 20, and 21: Items renumbering sections of House bill. House conferees recede.

On amendment No. 10, page 22: Modification and readjustment of terms of uncompleted contracts for work of river and harbor improvement. Item adds new section providing that if the Secretary of War shall determine that contracts for work of river and harbor improvement entered into prior to April 6, 1917, and uncompleted, have become inequitable and unjust on account of increased costs of material and labor and other unforeseen conditions arising out of the war, he is authorized to modify and readjust the terms of said contracts in a just and equitable manner, such modifications and readjustments to apply only to work under said contracts remaining to be done hereafter, and any such sum as may be necessary to provide for the increased cost of the contracts due to said modifications and readjustments, not exceeding the sum of \$2,000,000, is appropriated by the new section. It is also provided that as a condition of any such contract being so modified that the Secretary of War shall have the right, at the end of any fiscal year, until the contract is completed, to make such further modifications as in his judgment shall be advantageous to the United States and just to the contractor. House conferees recede with verbal amendment, substituting the word "being" for the word "be," in line 10, page 23.

On amendment No. 11, page 23: Item adopts the following section:

"Sec. 10. That hereafter when the expenses of persons engaged in field work or traveling on official business outside of the District of Columbia and away from their designated posts of duty are chargeable to appropriations of the Engineer Department, a per diem of not exceeding \$4 may be allowed in lieu of subsistence when not otherwise fixed by law."

House conferees recede.

JNO. H. SMALL,
CHAS. F. BOOHER,
C. A. KENNEDY,

Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from North Carolina if this is a complete agreement?

Mr. SMALL. It is complete except as to one Senate amendment, for Mobile Harbor.

Mr. WALSH. And the gentleman expects to ask the House to insist upon its disagreement to that?

Mr. SMALL. Yes; I expect to ask the House to insist upon its disagreement upon that Senate amendment.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes next after the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HOLLAND].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia has no privilege to proceed as yet.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I understood that the gentleman from Virginia would be recognized after the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. MEEKER].

The SPEAKER. The Chair will recognize him to make a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House after the gentleman from Missouri concludes, for not exceeding 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia asks unanimous consent to address the House for not exceeding 10 minutes after the gentleman from Missouri concludes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes following the gentleman from Virginia.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Washington asks unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes following the gentleman from Virginia. Is there objection to that request?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized.

STATUS OF ALIEN SOLDIERS IN THE ARMIES OF THE WORLD.

Mr. MEEKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask permission to extend my remarks in the Record, and I wish to assure the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] that I will not put any applause in the extended remarks.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MEEKER. Mr. Speaker, about a year ago, after we had entered the war, we discovered that some 40,000 or 50,000 American citizens had entered the armies of England, France, and Canada. We learned at that time that the men who had taken the oath of allegiance to the British Crown had decitizenized themselves. Steps were taken to repatriate those men. That legislation has already been enacted. However, at the time that bill was under discussion in the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization the question came up as to the status of alien soldiers in the different nations throughout the world. I took up the question with the representatives of the several countries throughout the world, requesting that they provide me with the oath which an alien desiring to enter the military or naval service must take. I also requested that they supply me with information on the following subjects:

First, as to how the taking of this oath affects the citizenship in the nation whose army the alien enters.

Second, does the taking of the oath make him a citizen in whole or in part in that country?

Third, how does it affect him as regards the right of franchise, devolution of property, marriage and divorce, and receiving a pension from the Government?

Fourth, should an alien who has taken the oath of allegiance and served in the military or naval forces and for that service has been granted a pension become a citizen of another nation, would he thereby forfeit his pension?

There is one thing about which we need to be thinking: Under our present laws if an alien who, leaving his family in the United States, has joined the forces of one of our cobelligerents, is wounded there and comes back, under our present law, he can not be admitted to the United States, because he might become a public charge.

One of the questions which we are going to have to think about and to discuss also with our cobelligerents is this: Will these cobelligerents of ours permit the pensions to follow these wounded aliens who desire to return to the United States? If they do, then there is no danger whatever of their becoming public charges in the United States. The more you think on the status of soldiers in alien armies the more difficult and delicate you will see the situation will become as time goes on after the war.

The data which I have here this morning and which I am submitting is not complete. It is such a long task to get all the information on the subject that I felt it might be better to put in now the data which we have and add to it as we may be able to get further light on the subject. I do not have here a report from China or from Russia, and, of course, not from Germany. A few of the smaller nations are yet to be heard from. I have not yet been able to obtain copies of the oaths taken by aliens entering the service of some of these nations, but the data which has been collected thus far is sufficient to show that practically no two nations in the world have the same system of taking aliens into their service or the same rules for providing for the men after they have finished their military service. This correspondence has convinced me that the United States has gone far ahead of any other nation in providing and caring for the aliens who enter her military service. There is much work yet to be done looking toward the final adjustment of the relations that should be maintained between our Government and the aliens who have served under the colors of our cobelligerents who are returning to this country in the hope of once more being with their families.

Mr. DENISON. Will the gentleman state the result of his investigation as to ascertaining what France has done and will do for those Americans who have been members of the Foreign Legion?

Mr. MEEKER. I can not offer any data on that subject. Of course, as I said, I think it will be absolutely necessary for us in a council of nations, which must inevitably come in the not far-distant future, to work out an entirely new system of caring for the alien soldiers who may pass from one country to another. At present we have not the data on the point the gentleman has raised.

The following information is compiled from reports received:

ARGENTINA.

Argentine military and naval forces are organized under the compulsory military law; therefore foreigners have nothing to do with that service and in peace times can not enter it.

There have been in other times what they called "foreign legions" fighting in time of war under the flag, but generally men serving in those legions have finished their services with the war without becoming citizens. If they have continued in the service, as has been the case several times, they have not been able to belong to the army or navy without being naturalized Argentinians in accordance with the laws of Argentina.

A naturalized citizen who enjoys a pension from the Argentine Government loses his pension if he resigns his citizenship.

BOLIVIA.

The fact of an alien taking military service in Bolivia does not make him a citizen and does not in any way affect his rights concerning property or his marriage obligations.

If pension is granted an alien, the right is not lost unless he should go to a country actually at war with Bolivia.

BRAZIL.

In both corps of the navy—national marines and naval battalions—foreigners are not admitted. Foreigners may only be accepted in the corps as extra firemen; are under contract for a fixed period, subject to military law, not required to give allegiance. In other words, they are civilians under military status while in the service of the navy.

Enlisted men do not lose original nationality, as the enlistment is not equivalent to naturalization.

Foreigners are placed in same class as natives in all that concerns acquisition and enjoyment of rights. It is understood that foreigners serving as soldiers have, with slight restrictions peculiar to their occupations, all civil rights which they enjoyed before enlisting, as follows: Contractual rights, marriage, raising family, divorce, property, disposal of property inter vivos or testamento, enjoyment of prizes, pensions, life insurance. Foreigners once admitted to the ranks as sailors shall not be entitled to political or electoral rights.

A pensioner of the State loses his pension if he goes to any foreign country without permission of the Government, but pensioner does not suffer any restriction if, before he leaves for foreign country, he obtains an official permit, even though he is a naturalized citizen.

BULGARIA.

No aliens can enter the military or naval service of Bulgaria unless he first becomes naturalized as a Bulgarian citizen, thereby acquiring all the rights and privileges of citizenship.

Alien civilians may be employed in offices which have no connection with active military service, such as clerks in the ministry of war, leaders of military bands, etc.

Should an alien who has taken the oath of allegiance and served in the military or naval forces, and for that service been granted a pension from the Bulgarian Government, become a citizen of another nation, he thereby forfeits his pension, and should he return to Bulgaria he would be liable in case of a general mobilization to be drafted into service.

CHILE.

Foreigners are admitted to the Chilean Army only under contracts when their services are indispensable or as attachés at the request of some friendly government; this also applies to the navy.

COLOMBIA.

No one can be admitted to the army without taking an oath to support and defend the constitution and to comply with all the obligations it imposes. This oath of itself does not make him a citizen of Colombia, and does not modify the statutes as to personal and real property of foreigners in Colombia, or to exercise the rights, natural and civil, that the laws of Colombia establish.

DENMARK.

Every man who is in possession of Danish citizenship is liable to military service, but only those aliens who have acquired a fixed residence in Denmark, and then only in so far as no treaty with a foreign State or the alien's duty toward such foreign State as a subject thereof would prevent the drafting of the alien into Danish military service. Neither the taking of the oath nor the military service would make an alien a Danish citizen or affect his status in civil life.

All officials and officers appointed by the King are entitled to a pension under certain conditions, but otherwise pension must be granted by special act. As a rule a pension can not, without special permission, be paid to a pensioner living outside of Denmark, but a mere change of citizenship would not affect the title to a pension.

ENGLAND.

The law forbids the giving of a commission to an alien, and an enlisted alien is not capable of being promoted to a commission. As regards other aliens, if a soldier is a negro or a person of color, by enlisting in His Majesty's regular forces he becomes entitled to all the privileges of a natural-born British subject. This will not give him any right of franchise unless he has a franchise qualification in some other way; and as regards devolution of property, marriage, and divorce, these depend generally on domicile and not on nationality. As regards other aliens enlisting, they do not by so doing get any civil rights of British subjects. They, therefore, get no right of franchise, and as regards devolution of property, marriage, and divorce, that depends generally on domicile and not on nationality; but so far as it may in any case depend on nationality, they would not be treated as British subjects.

As regards the right to receive a pension, an enlisted alien is in exactly the same position as any other soldier. In case of war between his country and Great Britain, his pension would not be paid to him during the war, and his pension ceases to be payable, except in special cases, if he ceases to reside in British dominions. If an alien or any other soldier becomes the subject of another nation, there is no provision to deprive him of his pension. Pension rights are not the creation of statutes but of royal warrants or orders in council, as the case may be, which provide for payment of pensions, if the money be provided by Parliament. There is no legal obligation on the State to pay any pension, but only an obligation of honor based on the fact that the State had pledged its credit. The above remarks apply generally to naval pensions.

The following oath is taken at the time of enlistment:

I, ———, do make oath that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to His Majesty King George the Fifth, his heirs and successors, and that I will, as in duty bound, honestly and faithfully defend His Majesty, his heirs and successors, in person, crown, and dignity against all enemies, and will observe and obey all orders of His Majesty, his heirs and successors, and of all the generals and officers set over me. So help me God.

FRANCE.

An alien who desires to enter the military or naval service of France is not asked to take an oath. He has only, under the present circumstances, to sign a paper pledging himself to serve while the present war lasts.

GREECE.

As a rule, no one but a Greek subject is admitted to the military or naval service in Greece. Exception is made in special cases when foreigners are accepted as special instructors, in which case their status is determined in details by a special law. In such cases the foreigners do not acquire the Greek citizenship.

GUATEMALA.

The Government has, on occasions, employed aliens as instructors and professors for the artillery and military academy, and they have been employed under a contract, but at present there are no aliens in the army. These aliens have been obliged, of course, to take the oath to observe the laws of the country during their stay. All aliens take the oath on the Constitution of the Republic. An alien who serves either in the army or any other position in the Government has to become a citizen, thereby losing any other citizenship.

HAITI.

No foreigner can be admitted to the Haitian Army or marine before declaring his intention to settle in Haiti and swearing that he renounces all other countries. This rule admits of exceptions and does not apply to American citizens who, conformable to the convention between the Republic of Haiti and the United States of America, are named by the President of Haiti, of the proposal of the United States to organize and command the new organization of gendarmes of Haiti.

A naturalized foreigner who has obtained a military pension from the Government of Haiti can not be denationalized.

HONDURAS.

During the stay of an alien in military or naval service he must obey the laws and ordinances as well as any Honduran citizen. The taking of the oath does not make him a citizen.

If he has served in military or naval forces, and for that service is granted a pension from the Government, becomes a citizen of another nation, he thereby forfeits his pension.

HOLLAND.

No aliens are taken into the Dutch Home Army at any time, with the possible exception of surgeon officers. Aliens may enter the Dutch Colonial Army in peace times.

An enlisted man signs a promise that he will serve six years, or whatever the term may happen to be. An officer swears loyalty to the sovereign, obedience to the laws, and submission to military discipline. These obligations are not considered as expressing or implying renunciation of citizenship in any other be naturalization before either obligation can be taken. Neither country. To enter the Dutch home military service there must obligation affects devolution of property, marriage, or divorce.

A Dutch soldier receiving a pension will forfeit it if he becomes a citizen of another country.

A foreigner can enlist only in the colonial army of the Dutch East Indies; they can not enlist in the home army. By such enlistment and by the oath required therefor, he does not acquire the Dutch citizenship, but he is entitled to a pension according to the rules and regulations of the service.

ITALY.

Only Italian citizens have the privilege of serving in the Italian Army and Navy, and are therefore requested to take the oath.

Aliens may volunteer for service, and take the oath only if they were born in the Italian Kingdom, or if they were born from parents having resided there at least 10 years at the time of their birth. By so doing they acquire Italian citizenship. Italians who have lost their citizenship are admitted to serve and take the oath and thus resume the citizenship they had lost.

JAPAN.

There is no legal impediment against the entry of an alien into the service, provided the Government so desires or orders, but his foreign nationality will preclude him from enjoying or exercising rights and duties exclusively pertaining to a Japanese subject. However, were he so admitted, his citizenship would not be affected even partially, nor would he change his status at all in respect to the right of franchise, devolution of property, marriage, and divorce. The minister of home affairs may, with the sanction of the Emperor, permit the naturalization of an alien who has done specially meritorious service to Japan, without regard to ordinary requirements.

There is no statute covering the case of an alien in general in regard to pensions. It may be paid on the basis of the contract entered into between the Government and the party concerned, or, lacking that, by the special grant of the Government. The Japanese Government is actually paying pensions to a few German professors who used to be in its civil service.

NICARAGUA.

An alien may obtain employment in the militia, but he must previously resign the protection of his own Government. The taking of the oath does not affect the citizenship of an alien at all; either it affects him as regards the right of franchise, devolution of property, marriage and divorce, and receiving pension from the Government. In order that an alien may become a citizen of Nicaragua it is necessary that he reside in the country for at least two consecutive years, and after that

that he make a declaration to the bureau of naturalization, or that he obtain the charta of naturalization in conformity with the law. Foreigners in Nicaragua enjoy the same civil rights as those conferred by the constitution to the Nicaraguans. In very few cases the law establishes differences between a Nicaraguan and an alien.

An alien who has served in the army or navy of Nicaragua will enjoy the same privileges and pensions that a Nicaraguan would enjoy, and by the fact that he became a citizen of another nation he would not forfeit these privileges and pensions.

NORWAY.

With the exception of salaried officers, no soldier takes an oath. The conscription oath was abolished in 1891. Military duty has no effect upon citizenship in Norway. Persons other than native-born Norwegians may be taken for duty when they are domiciled in the land. The fact that a foreigner resides in Norway, however, does not mean that he must serve; neither does the law state that he shall have resided in Norway for a certain length of time, but his relations to Norway must be so firm that he must really be domiciled there. A foreigner who does military duty in Norway does not for that reason become a Norwegian subject.

Military duty has no influence upon the right to vote, nor upon the transfer of property, marriage, or divorce. Only subjects of Norway can vote, and foreigners may not acquire property lawfully except by permission of the King.

At present there are no fixed rules for pensions other than for salaried officers. A pensioner who resides out of Norway will not be paid his pension except by permission of the King, when drawing kroner 200 or over, and when drawing less permission must be obtained from the department. These rules apply to both civil and military pensioners.

PANAMA.

Panama has no army or navy, the national police corps being the only corporation in charge of the custody of public order. There is no objection to foreigners joining the police corps, and the oath consists in swearing to defend the constitution and laws of the country.

An alien joining the police corps does not lose his citizenship according to the Panama laws, and this loss depends only upon the laws of the country of which the alien is a citizen.

PERU.

No aliens are permitted to serve in the Peruvian Army. A few aliens are serving in the Peruvian Army as engineers and mechanics. Their condition is similar to that of individuals engaged by contract for a given period of time, and they do not thereby become Peruvian citizens. Citizenship is acquired after a residence in Peru of two years, without requiring an oath. Aliens in Peru possess the same rights affecting property and marriage as Peruvians. As regards divorce, their rights are governed by the laws of their country.

No pension has ever been granted by the Peruvian Government to any alien, and should a naturalized Peruvian citizen become a citizen of another country he would thereby forfeit his pension.

PORTUGAL.

There is no provision of law authorizing the enlistment of aliens in the Portuguese Army or Navy.

Naturalized citizens are subject to compulsory service.

SALVADOR.

The foreigner in Salvador who desires to enter the national army must swear loyalty to the country and absolute submission to the authorities.

When a foreigner joins the army simply as an instructor, he does not lose by that fact his citizenship, nor acquire that of Salvador.

The soldier, as well as the civilian, who adopts another nationality, naturally loses rights that belonged to his former citizenship.

SERBIA.

An alien desiring to enter the Serbian Army must take an oath of fidelity to his superiors and of submission to the military laws. Service in the army does not affect his citizenship without his express wish to that effect. The taking of the oath does not make him a citizen of Serbia if he does not wish so. The Serbian citizenship is obtained only by the written request of the alien.

Aliens serving in the Serbian Army do not change their civil status in respect to the rights of franchise, property, marriage, or divorce. They are considered as volunteers.

SIAM.

Aliens entering the Siamese Army do not take an oath, but sign a contract which varies according to the nature of the employment.

The only way in which Siamese citizenship may be acquired by an alien is through his naturalization by law or by special decree of the King.

SPAIN.

To enter the army of Spain one must be a Spanish subject or a naturalized Spaniard. The oath to the flag is sworn after having entered the army and after having received elementary instruction.

Spanish citizenship is obtained by acquiring a letter of naturalization or by acquiring residence in any municipality of the monarchy, the rights of Spanish citizens being acquired thereby.

If a person deriving a pension on account of services in the Spanish Army acquires foreign citizenship he loses his pension. The same laws apply to the navy.

SWEDEN.

No alien is admitted to the army or navy of Sweden.

An alien must have resided in the country for at least three years previous to his admission as a citizen, and before entering either army or navy must have been naturalized and been admitted to Swedish citizenship.

SWITZERLAND.

The Swiss constitution provides for a universal military service.

Subject to all such service are all male citizens from 20 to 44 years of age.

Aliens are exempt from service and can under no circumstances serve in the Swiss armed forces.

No pensions are paid by the Swiss Government.

TURKEY.

No oath is required from Turkish subjects nor aliens who desire to enter the military or naval forces of Turkey.

The enlistment in the Turkish Army or Navy does not make an alien a subject of the Ottoman Empire either in whole or in part.

It does not affect him as regards the right of franchise, devolution of property, marriage, or divorce.

The soldier and his family are entitled to receive a pension from the Government.

If an alien takes the oath of allegiance to the Turkish Empire and serves in the military and naval forces, and for that service is granted a pension, becomes a citizen of another nation, he forfeits his pension.

UNITED STATES.

The oath, when taken by an alien, does not affect his citizenship in the United States. It does not make him a citizen in whole or in part. It does not affect franchise, devolution of property, marriage and divorce, or a pension—except as to Indian wars.

In time of peace no person who is not a citizen of the United States or who has not made legal declaration of his intention to become a citizen, and so forth, shall be enlisted for the first enlistment in the Army.

Judge Advocate General E. H. Crowder says: "The statutes appear to contain no provision that a pension shall be forfeited by reason of becoming a citizen of another country. It seems improbable that an executive department would conceive itself to have the power to depart from the general theory of the pension laws, which is to the effect that when a person has become entitled to a pension he has become so by reason of service and not by reason of citizenship—whence it seems necessary to conclude that change of citizenship can not affect the pension."

At the time of his enlistment every soldier shall take the following oath or affirmation: "I, _____, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the United States of America; that I will serve them honestly and faithfully against all their enemies whomsoever; and that I will obey the orders of the President of the United States and the orders of the officers appointed over me according to the Rules and Articles of War."

VENEZUELA.

According to the Military Code of Venezuela only Venezuelans are permitted to serve in the army. Under the provisions of the Federal Constitution it is an attribute of Congress to permit or not the admission of foreigners to the service of the Republic.

The constitutional provision referred to indicates that a foreigner admitted to the service of the Republic does not lose his status as such, and that his services are considered as rendered under a mere contract.

The Venezuelan pension laws refer solely to Venezuelan citizens.

By unanimous consent, Mr. FORDNEY was given leave to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD.

NAVAL BASE AT HAMPTON ROADS.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, I was not in the House last Friday when the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JOHNSON] made certain statements which, if true, would reflect on me, on the people of the district I have the honor to represent, on the Secretary of the Navy and several of his trusted advisers, and especially on the owners of the property recently acquired by the Government for a naval operating base on Hampton Roads. Usually I pay no attention to remarks based on mere idle gossip, but as this speech has been printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and might accidentally be read by those who do not know the facts, I shall depart from my usual rule and ask that I may be given time to make a short reply.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman give the page of the RECORD where the remarks of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JOHNSON] are printed?

Mr. HOLLAND. Page 7253.

The gentleman repeats certain slanderous statements which he claims were made to him by certain citizens of Newport News and Norfolk in reference to the value of the naval-base property and the manner in which it was acquired, accuses the people of my district of indefensible profiteering, and then boastfully declares that his own people were good enough to buy and give to the Government for war purposes a great tract of land of 80,000 acres. "The two transactions," said he, "stand out in vivid contrast."

I shall not believe that such slanderous statements were made by reputable citizens until the gentleman has furnished me their names and I have had an opportunity to investigate their standing at home. Reputable citizens do not so willfully slander the people among whom they live. I know there are a number of sensational gossipers in every community, whose chief delight consists in running around and telling idle tales, and the men who expressed the opinions claimed were evidently men of this kind and not worthy and patriotic citizens. The very statements furnish the best evidence that they were not, and belie the good sense, the good judgment, and the patriotism of the men who made them. Men who stand idly by and silently and knowingly permit a fraud to be perpetrated on their Government which by their own statements they might have prevented are almost as criminal as the men who actually perpetrate it. I have no patience with men who have evidence of wrongdoing and then deliberately fail or refuse to disclose it. I would never make the statements of such men the basis of slanderous speech in this House. I would never offer their utterances as proof of the accuracy of my own statements. But some people love to repeat gossip and without investigating its truth or falsity.

I advocated the purchase of this property at the price at which it was offered by the owners, and to that extent I am responsible for its acquisition by the Government. Before advocating its purchase I ascertained that Secretary Daniels, following the example of Secretaries Meyer and Bonaparte and the advice of every expert in his department, had recommended its purchase or condemnation. It was declared by them to be the only available, satisfactory site on Hampton Roads that could be developed and equipped as a fleet-operating base and that its acquisition was essential for war purposes. If the Secretary of the Navy and his advisers, the men responsible, especially in time of war, for keeping the Navy in a proper and efficient condition, can not be safely trusted to determine what property is urgently needed for "war purposes," then, in God's name, who can be trusted? I reached no hurried or biased conclusion as to its value. I read the statements of the Secretary of the Navy and his expert advisers, who recommended its purchase at the price named by the owners, and I then advised with hundreds of the most representative business men of Norfolk, men fully acquainted with real-estate values in that section and having no interest in the property, before I reached the conclusion that the price was fair and just. I had absolutely no interest in the property. My constituents were able to hold it and had no need or inclination to resort to improper methods to dispose of it. And I brand as slanderous and as absolutely untrue even an indirect intimation that I would aid or abet one or a number of my constituents in any scheme to impose upon the Government. I would brand it in still stronger language if the rules of this House would permit. When I can not render the Government, as well as my constituents, honest and patriotic service, I shall then become unworthy to be a Member of this great body. But why did not these patriots at least furnish me the information which it is claimed was given to the gentleman from Washington?

Nor do the facts justify the statements said to have been made by these gentlemen that the owners of this property are unpatriotic and have imposed on the Government. Such statements are also slanderous and untrue. The owners offered to sell the property to the Government for the sum of \$1,400,000,

and we have the statement of the Secretary of the Navy that this was a just and fair price. We have also the statements of Capt. McKean and other naval experts who were appointed to make a special investigation of the subject matter to the same effect. Do you question their honesty or their judgment? Do you not at least believe that they had sense enough to discover an attempt to impose on the Government, if any such attempt had been made? When this proposition was under discussion in the House and some question was raised as to the value of the property, I made the offer, on the part of the owners, to have its value determined by condemnation or by any other fair method. I was willing to trust the courts to determine its value. But subsequently the House, upon the recommendation of the Committee on Naval Affairs, authorized its condemnation and directed that its value should be determined by a board or commission appointed for that purpose. This board was appointed by order of July 21, 1917, and after a careful and painstaking investigation, made on the premises, with opportunity to every one who desired it to be heard, submitted its award on the 5th day of December, 1917. It awarded the owners the sum of \$1,422,935. This award was subsequently approved by the Secretary of the Navy and by the President. The gentleman from Washington evidently was not familiar with these facts. They refute, and beyond question, his indefensible statement, based on the weakest kind of evidence, that the owners "worked" the Government for a fancy price for their property. Did the Secretary of the Navy and his expert advisers and also the special board to determine its value corruptly collude with the owners in the perpetration of a fraud upon the Government? No one would believe this. And yet the owners, if they "worked" the Government, must have done so through these officials. But where were these patriots all this time? Why did not they appear before this board, which for four long months, and on the premises, was making diligent effort to ascertain the real value of this property, and testify that the Government was about to be "worked" for a fancy price? This would have been far more patriotic than to indulge now in unwarranted criticism.

The people of the district I have the honor to represent are with few exceptions native-born Americans. They are as loyal, as patriotic, as honest, and as severely condemn profiteering as the citizens of any other State. They have shown their courage and their patriotism in every crisis that has confronted this Government; and history will prove that this has been done by their deeds, not by their professions. I have no indictment to bring against the people of the great State of Washington. I would not bring an indictment against them upon the testimony of mere gossipers. The very name "Washington" is sacred to all Virginians. But I do most strongly resent the insinuations of its Representative in this body and his boastful intimation that his people are more honest, more loyal, or more patriotic than are the people of old Virginia. I recall the old story of the man who stood up in the temple and boastfully thanked God that he was better than other men and especially better than the poor man who at the same time was beseeching his Father to be merciful to him a sinner. That story has always impressed me, and I have made it a rule never to boast of my own good deeds and never to impugn the motives of men who may be just as honest and just as patriotic as I profess to be. I commend this story to the gentleman from Washington, and if he will read it I do not believe he will again wrongfully and unjustly condemn the people of an entire community. People are frequently better than we think they are. This is no time for crimination or recrimination. The boys from Washington and from Virginia are doubtless now standing side by side on the battle front, each vying with the other in a supreme effort to win this war. Why can not we, as the Representatives of the same great States, stop indulging in such unjust criticisms and stand side by side in united effort to accomplish the same great purpose? Such a course would furnish the best evidence of a more genuine patriotism.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. JOHNSON] is recognized for not to exceed 10 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, in the few remarks made by me on Friday afternoon during the discussion of the Army appropriation bill I discussed the price paid by the Government for the site of the old Jamestown Exposition property in Virginia. I beg to assure the House that I had no thought in mind of reflecting upon the activities of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HOLLAND], who represents that district. The gentleman has just stated that he wonders why people who said to me that the price was too high did not say so when certain men in that neighborhood were selling this site. Because I presume they knew that the price carried a large part of the losses of the Jamestown Exposition, and would

have been criticised by many of their own fellow citizens if they had so stated. I presume, too, that in many congressional districts the Members, while elected to come here and serve the Nation, are expected, each and every one, to bring home some bacon for his district. That has been the rule. Constituents rarely, if ever, blame a man for getting all that he can for his district. But the House is correcting that a little. But the point in what I said about the Jamestown sale was this: Having stated what the citizens told me about these sales, I said—

Here in the House we have stood by and let things like this go through under the guise of war necessities. We must not do it again. It is not too late to cut down these bills. It is time to quit throwing away money like water.

Mr. Speaker, I said that, and I stand by it. Now, the stories that I heard may have been gossip, told me during a pleasant visit to the National Soldiers' Home in that vicinity, but no one whom I met seemed to know the exact details of the transaction. Every Member of the House here was a party to it. Few Members know the exact details. We were dependent upon reports, and finally upon the conference report. I said Friday that I thought we had paid \$1,200,000. I now correct the figures, based on the statement of the gentleman from Virginia himself. We paid \$1,422,530, or \$200,000 odd more than I thought we paid. I said that they had demanded \$1,200,000, and after the thing had been voted down here in the House, the Members of the House not being willing to stand for it, that we had then paid \$1,000,000.

I ascertain now that we paid \$1,200,000, and I am told that citizens involved in the ownership of the property making that sale were asked to accept that sum, and if any of them were not satisfied with the proposed rate or proportion that they received they could accept 75 per cent in money and sue the Government.

But, Mr. Speaker, I do not care to pursue that any further. It has gone by. It is an example of some high prices that have been paid. This House has been unable to help itself. When we did protest and vote against this, immediately there came statements that we could not controvert that it was an absolute war necessity. That statement was made in the Committee on Naval Affairs, and the statement was also made that the finger of God pointed to this as the place. These men who had it to sell received a price of \$1,400,000, when it had been hawked around town for sale at a greatly less price. I stated that the offered price was \$300,000, but I am told it was bought at a forced sale for \$400,000; that no outsiders bid at the auction, for the reason that they knew that if they bought it that it carried a lot of bills and liens of the collapsed Jamestown Exposition. So, as a matter of fact, after the Secretary of the Navy had recommended this and urged it after the House had turned it down, there were attached to the price paid for it the debts of the Jamestown Exposition. That and the fact the Government wanted it gave it its value.

I have no controversy with the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HOLLAND]. I know him to be a faithful, hard-working Member of this body, and I will not quarrel with him. His people got the money. Some of them rapped at me a little bit—said this Congress was "easy"—and I claimed I had a right to warn every Member, including myself, that we must scrutinize these bills in the future.

Mr. MAYS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes; certainly.

Mr. MAYS. Does the gentleman have the names of those men who said that this Congress was "easy"?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes; I have two or three of the names.

Mr. MAYS. Will the gentleman give the names?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I can do it, but before I do give the names I wish to say that there is a distinguished gentleman from my State who is down there now, and if necessary I can wire him to investigate thoroughly this question.

Mr. MAYS. Will the gentleman give the names?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I have not the names with me at this moment. Now, I find in this morning's New York Sun an editorial concerning another sudden increase in land values, and to show that I do not pick out any one place for criticism I want to say that this locality is near Los Angeles.

Congress appropriated \$80,000 for the acquisition of 12 acres of land at Point Vincent, Cal., 12 miles from the harbor, in which to place a new lighthouse. It was owned by a syndicate which demanded \$632,000 for the property, \$32,000 for the land itself and \$600,000 for the depreciation in value of the remaining property of the syndicate at and about Point Vincent, where it is proposed to establish a fine residence section.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes.

Mr. COX. Are these profiteers on the Pacific coast going to get that \$600,000?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. No; when the price was raised \$600,000 the lighthouse project was abandoned. Secretary Redfield declined to proceed further with it. The Sun criticizes Mr. Redfield, says he should not have quit, and says that if the Government were always frightened off by the exorbitant claim of landowners the country would have to get along without any more new public buildings, forts, or lighthouses. Then the Sun discusses the right of the Government to the property of its citizens, and in conclusion the editorial states what I think should have been done in the Jamestown case:

A judicial proceeding to condemn the necessary land in this case would settle once for all the vexed questions whether such a claim for the alleged depreciation of land not taken can properly be allowed to augment the award of the land taken.

Now, I think when the purchase price of land reaches such a discussion as this site at Jamestown did the United States Government would do well to have a judicial proceeding to determine the real value and not the value created by the fact that the Government wants it. I know, as every Member knows, that when we go back to our districts this fall and undertake to explain all of these tremendous expenditures of money each Member is likely to pick out for criticism the expenditure which looks to him the rankest, and for myself I am likely to pick out Jamestown and set that \$1,400,000 sale in time of war up against the \$2,000,000 gift of land by the citizens of Tacoma, in the district which I have the honor to represent.

Mr. CARAWAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes; certainly.

Mr. CARAWAY. Before the gentleman sits down will he tell the House what he means by each Member wanting to take home some bacon?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Oh, the gentleman knows, surely. I think it has been well known for years past that when a man is elected to Congress and is sent here to help perform full service for this great Government, to participate in the making of laws, he is also expected to look out for the wants of his district—get post-office buildings, river and harbor improvements, nitrate plants, and all that—and if he gets them he will be considered as a good Representative of his district. Of course that does not always mean reelection, for let me say that the man who has taken home the most bacon in recent years was Judge Wickersham, of Alaska, who engineered an appropriation for a railroad in Alaska costing \$35,000,000.

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman please say what he means? That does not say what he means by the word "bacon." Does the gentleman mean something that is dishonorable?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Oh, no, no. What I tried to say—

Mr. CARAWAY. Let me finish my question. Will the gentleman say why he used that expression in talking about the Jamestown Exposition space, for which he said the Government pays too much?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Oh, well—

Mr. CARAWAY. Was not the inference that way—

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I used it as slang, as an expression of the street. I would not criticize the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HOLLAND] here or elsewhere for trying to prove that the site was worth \$1,400,000. I have not criticized him. His people, most of them, no doubt believe that it was worth that. It had attached to it a part of the debt of the Jamestown Exposition. The criticism falls upon all the rest of us, as we failed to stand by our real judgment in the matter, which is the statement I made in the first place and which is all there is to it.

CALENDAR FOR UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

The SPEAKER. This is unanimous-consent day, and the Chair will ask the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOSTER] to take the chair.

Mr. FOSTER assumed the chair as Speaker pro tempore.

SALARY OF DISTRICT ATTORNEY, RHODE ISLAND.

The first business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 3563) to increase the salary of the United States district attorney for the district of Rhode Island.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. DYER. Mr. Speaker, let us have the bill reported.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That from and after the passage of this act the salary of the United States district attorney for the district of Rhode Island shall be at the rate of \$5,000 a year.

With the following committee amendment:

Line 5, strike out "\$5,000" and insert "\$3,500."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. CRAMTON. I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan objects, and the Clerk will report the next bill.

Mr. STINESS. Mr. Speaker, before that is done, will the gentleman withhold his objection for a moment?

Mr. CRAMTON. I withhold the objection for a moment.

Mr. STINESS. Mr. Speaker, I hope the gentleman from Michigan will not press his objection at this time. This bill has been here for two years. The recommendation of the United States district judge three years ago was that this salary be increased to \$4,000. I know something of the duties of the office, because I held the office just before the present incumbent. I know that during the last two years and since the war these duties have increased very much, and I think there is no reason why this salary should not be increased, on account of the increased duties of the office and on account of the increased cost of living. Because of the war various new duties have been thrust upon the present incumbent, and it seems to me that the salary ought to be increased.

Mr. SANFORD. What is the present salary?

Mr. STINESS. Two thousand five hundred dollars. That salary has been paid for a great many years. It used to be the custom that the person who held the office practiced law generally, but of late years that has changed, and the United States district attorney must now devote all of his time to the duties of the office. If the gentleman from Michigan were familiar with the duties of the office, I know that he would not make the objection.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Speaker, I want also to appeal to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON] not to object to this bill. It has received very careful consideration from the Committee on the Judiciary. We have had hearings upon it and have gone into it very carefully. The conclusion is that it is an outrage to ask a man of ability to be a district attorney of the United States for the salary that is now being paid in this case. It is far below that paid the district attorneys all over the United States as a general proposition. The Committee on the Judiciary considered this and unanimously reported the bill and urged that it be passed. I hope the gentleman from Michigan will not object to considering the bill upon its merits.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right further to object, I do not care to go into the merits of the bill further than to suggest this, that it is to be assumed that the Department of Justice is as familiar with the needs and merits of that official as any of us, and the report of the committee upon this bill proposes a larger salary than the Department of Justice recommends. Further than that, this same bill was before us in the last Congress, and the question was raised as to the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary to handle bills of this kind. There is no question about the jurisdiction under the rules, and it is a mystery to me why gentlemen should persist in having their bills referred to a committee that does not have jurisdiction of them. The rules provide that "the examination of the accounts and expenditures of the several departments of the Government and the manner of keeping the same," and so forth, "the abolishment of useless offices, the reduction or increase of the pay of officers, shall all be subjects within the jurisdiction" of the nine standing committees on the public expenditures of the several departments, and that expenditures in the Department of Justice shall be referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Justice. Rather than raise the point of order on these bills I make objection at this time.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes.

Mr. DYER. Will the gentleman state whether or not any of the committees on the expenditures to which he has referred has ever brought in a bill increasing the pay of a district attorney or a district judge of the United States?

Mr. CRAMTON. I shall answer the gentleman by stating that at this session of Congress the Committee on Expenditures of the Department of Justice, of which I am a member, has recommended a bill for the increase of the salary of a district attorney in the district of Connecticut, and that bill is now on the calendar.

Mr. STINESS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes.

Mr. STINESS. I would suggest to the gentleman that the recommendation made here by the judge of the district court and also by the Department of Justice was made two years ago. Since that time we have been in war. About Narragansett Bay there are a dozen forts where there are a large

number of soldiers, and there are a great many prosecutions for the sale of liquor in the war zone, and other offenses.

There have been a great many prosecutions under the espionage act and other matters of that kind, so that there has been a very large increase in the duties of the office. Now, I have no quarrel with the gentleman from Michigan about what committee this should go to; I do not care. If it has gone to the wrong committee I am sorry, but the fact is that the man who performs the duties of the office at \$2,500 a year should be paid at least \$5,000, and it seems to me fair to consider this as a war measure, because these duties have increased on account of the war, and with all these forts and soldiers and new duties it seems to me this man should be paid more. Now, when I held that office, which was immediately before the present incumbent, when I first went into the office there was not so much to do. We had two terms of the grand jury a year, and it took four or five days for a term. The work increased after that, so that the grand jury is in almost continuous session and sits there three or four weeks at a time. I did not ask for an increase in my own salary because a different administration had come in, and I realized that it was not going to be long that I would remain in that office. This gentleman took my place. He is a good Democrat, he is a good official, he is capable, he is performing the duties with ability, and because this bill has gone to some committee to which the gentleman thinks it should not have gone, I hope he will not let that stand in the way of giving this man the salary to which he is entitled. He can not live on \$2,500, and there is no use talking about it. It is not a living salary, as the gentleman knows, and therefore I hope he will withdraw any objection that he has about its going from one committee to another and let the bill pass on its merits.

Mr. CRAMTON. I suggest to the gentleman that the consideration as to the cost of living, and so forth, will apply to all district attorneys, and it seems to me the logical way is to have the whole subject given consideration in an exhaustive way by the proper committee.

Mr. STINESS. I will say to the gentleman that this case is different from the ordinary cases of district attorneys, because on account of the war many activities are centered in the district. There is the naval training station, the torpedo station, and thousands and thousands of men are there who were not there before.

Mr. RAKER. Will the gentleman yield? There has been more or less controversy over this matter and measures of a similar nature. There has been a contest on the floor of this House whether these small committees are doing work. There was a question whether or not they should have assistance when Congress met at the beginning of the session. Under the rules this committee has jurisdiction of this class of bills. The Judiciary Committee and the large committees of the House are flooded with business, and why do not you ask unanimous consent to have the bill stricken from the calendar and refer it to the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Justice, and the gentleman will get his bill reported out. It ought to be objected to, we ought not to let the bill go through.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have a word to say. I am the man who introduced the bill, and I am very grateful to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. STINESS] for saying something in advocacy of it. Because I felt anything I might say to the gentleman from Michigan would be absolutely lost upon him. I kept quiet. Anything I might say would be absolutely lost on him. I have tried to save the time of the House. Whatever effort I made would be in vain, dealing, as I was, with that kind of intelligence.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, objection not having been made the second time to letting the bill go through in the last Congress in this shape, the gentleman did not appreciate the courtesy, but comes in this Congress and insists again on it after he had notice that I objected.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. Mr. Speaker, let me say—

Mr. CRAMTON. I will object, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. May I ask unanimous consent to address the House for a minute?

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I object.

[Mr. O'SHAUNESSY here used words which were subsequently stricken out.]

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order, and I ask that the gentleman's words be taken down.

[Mr. O'SHAUNESSY here used words which were subsequently stricken out.]

Mr. WALSH. I ask that the last remark of the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. O'SHAUNESSY] be taken down. The gentleman can not stand here and insult the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will withhold until the Chair can state the question.

Mr. CRAMTON. I make the point of order that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. O'SHAUNESSY] did not have the floor, and that his language can not appear in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It was by unanimous consent only, and anyone has a right to object. But the gentleman demands that the words be taken down.

Mr. WALSH. I ask that the second remark be taken down.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks that the second remark of the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. O'SHAUNESSY] be taken down. It will be done.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. Mr. Speaker, in order to let business proceed, I will withdraw the remark. Possibly we will find others at another time.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Speaker, I object, unless he has the right under the rules to do that.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. When a request is made that the words be taken down, it can not be withdrawn except by unanimous consent. Is there objection?

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. I object. I insist that the words be taken down and that the House pass upon them.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the language objected to.

The words objected to and afterwards ordered stricken from the RECORD were read by the Clerk.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the words be stricken from the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Those in favor of the motion will say "aye," those opposed "no."

Mr. DYER. On that I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently there is no quorum present, and the Clerk will call the roll.

Mr. RUSSELL. I move a call of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is an automatic call of the House.

Mr. WALSH. I desire to inquire of the Chair if we are in the House or not. If so, where is the mace?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. We are in the House.

The Clerk will call the roll. Those in favor of expunging the words from the RECORD will, as their names are called, answer "yea," and those opposed will answer "nay."

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 269, answered "present" 6, not voting 155, as follows:

YEAS—269.

Alexander	Dewalt	Haugen	McKenzie
Almon	Dickinson	Hawley	McLemore
Anderson	Dill	Hayden	Madden
Ashbrook	Dillon	Heffin	Mansfield
Aswell	Dixon	Helm	Mapes
Ayres	Dominick	Helvering	Martin
Bankhead	Doolittle	Hensley	Mays
Barkley	Dupré	Hersey	Meeker
Barnhart	Dyer	Holland	Merritt
Benkes	Eagan	Huddleston	Miller, Minn.
Beshlin	Eagle	Hull, Iowa	Miller, Wash.
Black	Edmonds	Hull, Tenn.	Mondell
Blackmon	Elliott	Humphreys	Moore, Ind.
Blanton	Ellsworth	Igoe	Morgan
Borland	Elston	James	Mott
Brand	Esch	Johnson, Ky.	Mudd
Britten	Evans	Johnson, Wash.	Neely
Browne	Fairfield	Jones	Nelson
Buchanan	Farr	Juni	Nicholls, S. C.
Burnett	Ferris	Kearns	Nolan
Burroughs	Fess	Keating	Oldfield
Byrnes, S. C.	Fields	Kelly, Pa.	Oliver, Ala.
Byrnes, Tenn.	Focht	Kennedy, Iowa	Oliver, N. Y.
Campbell, Kans.	Fordney	Key, Ohio	Osborne
Campbell, Pa.	Foster	Kincheloe	O'Shaunessy
Candler, Miss.	Frear	King	Park
Cannon	Freeman	Kinkaid	Parker, N. J.
Cantrill	French	Knutson	Platt
Carlin	Fuller, Ill.	Kraus	Polk
Carter, Okla.	Gallivan	La Follette	Pon
Chandler, N. Y.	Gard	Larsen	Purnell
Chandler, Okla.	Garner	Lazaro	Quin
Church	Garrett, Tenn.	Lea, Cal.	Ragsdale
Claypool	Garrett, Tex.	Lee, Ga.	Raney, H. T.
Cleary	Glynn	Lehlbach	Raker
Coady	Godwin, N. C.	Linthicum	Randall
Collier	Good	Little	Rankin
Connally, Tex.	Goodall	Littlepage	Rayburn
Connolly, Kans.	Goodwin, Ark.	Lobeck	Reavis
Cooper, Wis.	Gould	London	Robbins
Cox	Graham, Ill.	Longworth	Roberts
Crosser	Gray, Ala.	Luffkin	Robinson
Curry, Cal.	Greene, Vt.	Lundeen	Rodenberg
Dallinger	Hadley	Lunn	Rogers
Davis	Hamilton, Mich.	McAndrews	Romjue
Decker	Hamlin	McArthur	Rouse
Delaney	Hardy	McClintic	Rubey
Dempsey	Harrison, Miss.	McCulloch	Rucker
Denison	Harrison, Va.		Russell
Dent	Haskell		
Denton			

Sanders, Ind.
Sanders, La.
Sanders, N. Y.
Sanford
Schall
Scott, Iowa
Scott, Mich.
Shallenberger
Sims
Slannott
Slayden
Slomp
Smith, Idaho
Smith, Mich.
Smith, C. B.
Snook
Stafford

Stengall
Stedman
Steele
Steenson
Stephens, Miss.
Sterling, Pa.
Strong
Summers
Switzer
Tague
Taylor, Ark.
Taylor, Colo.
Temple
Thomas
Thompson
Thilman
Timberlake

Towner
Van Dyke
Venable
Vestal
Vinson
Voigt
Volstead
Waldow
Walker
Walsh
Walton
Wason
Watkins
Watson, Va.
Welling
Whaley
Wheeler

White, Me.
White, Ohio
Williams
Wilson, Ill.
Wilson, La.
Wilson, Tex.
Wingo
Winslow
Wood, Ind.
Woodyard
Wright
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Tex.
Zihlman

Cramton
Dowell

Hastings
Jacoway

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—6.

NOT VOTING—155.

Anthony
Austin
Bacharach
Baer
Bell
Bland
Booher
Bowers
Brodbeck
Browning
Brumbaugh
Butler
Caldwell
Caraway
Carew
Carter, Mass.
Cary
Clark, Fla.
Clark, Pa.
Classon
Cooper, Ohio
Cooper, W. Va.
Copley
Costello
Crago
Crisp
Currie, Mich.
Dale, N. Y.
Dale, Vt.
Darrow
Davidson
Dies
Donovan
Dooling
Doremus
Doughton
Drane
Drukker
Dunn

Emerson
Estopinal
Fairchild, E. L.
Fairchild, G. W.
Fisher
Flood
Flynn
Foss
Francis
Gallagher
Gandy
Garland
Gillett
Glass
Gordon
Graham, Pa.
Gray, N. J.
Green, Iowa
Greene, Mass.
Gregg
Griest
Griffin
Hamill
Hamilton, N. Y.
Hayes
Heaton
Heintz
Hicks
Hilliard
Hollingsworth
Hood
Houston
Howard
Husted
Hutchinson
Ireland
Johnson, S. Dak.
Kahn
Kehoe

Kelley, Mich.
Kennedy, R. I.
Kless, Pa.
Kitchin
Kreider
LaGuardia
Leshner
Lever
McCormick
McFadden
McKinley
McLaughlin, Mich.
McLaughlin, Pa.
Magee
Maher
Mann
Mason
Montague
Moore, Pa.
Morin
Nichols, Mich.
Norton
Overmyer
Overstreet
Padgett
Paige
Parker, N. Y.
Peters
Phelan
Porter
Powers
Pratt
Price
Raney, J. W.
Ramsey
Ramseyer
Reed
Riordan
Rose

Stiness

Rowe
Rowland
Sabath
Saunders, Va.
Scott, Pa.
Scully
Sears
Sells
Shackelford
Sherley
Sherwood
Shouse
Siegel
Sisson
Sloan
Small
Smith, T. F.
Snell
Snyder
Stephens, Nebr.
Sterling, Ill.
Stevenson
Sullivan
Sweet
Swift
Talbot
Templeton
Tilson
Tinkham
Treadway
Vare
Ward
Watson, Pa.
Weaver
Webb
Welty
Wise
Woods, Iowa

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. BRUMBAUGH with Mr. DALE of Vermont.
Mr. HILLIARD with Mr. MASON.
Mr. BELL with Mr. NICHOLS of Michigan.
Mr. CALDWELL with Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island.
Mr. GRIFFIN with Mr. COOPER of West Virginia.
Mr. DONOVAN with Mr. IRELAND.
Mr. BOOHER with Mr. HAMILTON of New York.
Mr. BRODBECK with Mr. TINKHAM.
Mr. SEARS with Mr. DOWELL.
Mr. LEVER with Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan.
Mr. OVERMYER with Mr. DUNN.
Mr. HOOD with Mr. HEATON.
Mr. STEPHENS of Nebraska with Mr. GEORGE W. FAIRCHILD.
Mr. SHACKLEFORD with Mr. AUSTIN.
Mr. SISSON with Mr. FOSS.
Mr. CAREW with Mr. ANTHONY.
Mr. DALE of New York with Mr. BACHARACH.
Mr. TALBOTT with Mr. BROWNING.
Mr. CRISP with Mr. CARTER of Massachusetts.
Mr. CARAWAY with Mr. BLAND.
Mr. DIES with Mr. BOWERS.
Mr. CLARK of Florida with Mr. BUTLER.
Mr. DOREMUS with Mr. COPLEY.
Mr. DRANE with Mr. CRAGO.
Mr. ESTOPINAL with Mr. CURRIE of Michigan.
Mr. FLOOD with Mr. DAVIDSON.
Mr. FLYNN with Mr. EMERSON.
Mr. GALLAGHER with Mr. BENJAMIN L. FAIRCHILD.
Mr. GANDY with Mr. NORTON.
Mr. GORDON with Mr. GARLAND.
Mr. GLASS with Mr. GILLETT.
Mr. GREGG with Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania.
Mr. HAMILL with Mr. GRAY of New Jersey.
Mr. HOWARD with Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts.
Mr. KEHOE with Mr. GRIEST.
Mr. HOUSTON with Mr. HAYES.
Mr. KITCHIN with Mr. HUSTED.

Mr. LESHAR with Mr. HUTCHINSON.
 Mr. MAHER with Mr. HICKS.
 Mr. MONTAGUE with Mr. KAHN.
 Mr. OVERSTREET with Mr. KIESS of Pennsylvania.
 Mr. PHELAN with Mr. KREIDER.
 Mr. PRICE with Mr. MCFADDEN.
 Mr. PADGETT with Mr. MCKINLEY.
 Mr. RIORDAN with Mr. SIEGEL.
 Mr. SABATH with Mr. SLOAN.
 Mr. SCULLY with Mr. ROWE.
 Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia with Mr. SNELL.
 Mr. SHERLEY with Mr. STERLING of Illinois.
 Mr. SHOUSE with Mr. SWIFT.
 Mr. SHERWOOD with Mr. TILSON.
 Mr. SMALL with Mr. TREADWAY.
 Mr. THOMAS F. SMITH with Mr. WARD.
 Mr. STEVENSON with Mr. KELLEY of Michigan.
 Mr. SULLIVAN with Mr. PRATT.
 Mr. WEBB with Mr. MAGEE.
 Mr. WEAVER with Mr. CLARK of Pennsylvania.
 Mr. WELTY with Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania.
 Mr. WISE with Mr. PAIGE.
 Mr. DOOLING with Mr. MCCORMICK.
 Mr. FISHER with Mr. PETERS.
 Mr. DOUGHTON with Mr. FRANCIS.
 Mr. JOHN W. RAINEY with Mr. REED.
 Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I am paired with the gentleman from Florida, Mr. SEARS. I desire to withdraw my vote of "yea" and be recorded as voting "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.
 The SPEAKER pro tempore. A quorum is present, and the Doorkeeper will open the doors. The Clerk will call the next bill on the calendar.

MEDALS OR DECORATIONS RECEIVED FROM FOREIGN COUNTRIES.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (S. 2796) to permit American citizens to wear medals or decorations received from certain foreign countries on entering the military or naval service of the United States, and for other purposes.

The title of the bill was read.
 The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of this bill?

Mr. STAFFORD. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, when this bill was last under consideration I understood the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT] had some remarks to make about it. I do not see him here at the present time. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over at the present time without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent that the bill be passed over at the present time without prejudice. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will call the next bill.

MEDALS OF HONOR AND DISTINGUISHED-SERVICE MEDALS.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (S. 1720) to provide for the award of medals of honor and distinguished-service medals.

The title of the bill was read.
 The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of this bill?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand that the Committee on Military Affairs is about to report a bill that will have the full support of the War Department. Therefore I object to the present consideration of this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin objects, and the bill will be stricken from the calendar. The Clerk will report the next bill.

JUDGMENT IN FAVOR OF THE CHEROKEE NATION.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 4699) providing for the payment of certain interest on items 1 and 4 of the judgment of the Court of Claims of May 18, 1905, in favor of the Cherokee Nation.

The title of the bill was read.
 The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oklahoma asks unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice. Is there objection?

Mr. WALSH. I object to the consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts objects, and the bill will be stricken from the calendar. The Clerk will report the next bill.

CLAIMS OF CHEROKEE NATION AGAINST THE UNITED STATES.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 357) conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, consider, and determine certain claims of the Cherokee Nation against the United States.

The title of the bill was read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of this bill?

Mr. WALSH. I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts objects. The Clerk will call the next bill.

INJURIES TO GREEK NATIONALS IN SOUTH OMAHA, NEBR.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 69) to authorize the payment of indemnities to the Government of Austria-Hungary, Greece, and Turkey for injuries inflicted on its nationals during riots occurring in South Omaha, Nebr., February 21, 1909.

The title of the bill was read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. I object, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin objects. The bill is stricken from the calendar. The Clerk will call the next bill.

ROCKY MOUNTAIN NATIONAL PARK, COLO.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 171) to repeal the last proviso of section 4 of an act to establish the Rocky Mountain National Park, in the State of Colorado, and for other purposes, approved January 26, 1915.

The title of the bill was read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of this bill?

Mr. STAFFORD. I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin objects. The Clerk will call the next bill.

SALARIES IN CUSTODIAN SERVICE, TREASURY DEPARTMENT.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 344) for the regulation of salaries in the custodian service of the Treasury Department.

The title of the bill was read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of this bill?

Mr. COX. I object, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Indiana objects. The bill is stricken from the calendar.

DETERMINATION OF HEIRSHIP, FIVE CIVILIZED TRIBES.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 10590) to provide for a determination of heirship in cases of deceased members of the Cherokee, Choctaw, Chickasaw, Creek, and Seminole Tribes of Indians in Oklahoma, conferring jurisdiction upon district courts to partition lands belonging to full-blood heirs of allottees of the Five Civilized Tribes, and for other purposes.

The title of the bill was read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of this bill?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I think some explanation ought to be made as to the necessity for passing this bill before waiving the right of objection.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, the reasons for the first section of the bill are set forth pretty clearly in the report, and especially in the brief of Mr. Semple, which, I am sure, the gentleman from Wisconsin has read.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. I think the House will be interested in that phase of the bill which seeks to make retroactive proceedings as to the title of real estate of Indians, to which this bill relates. I think that is rather an objectionable feature of the bill.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. I agree with the gentleman, Mr. Speaker, and if unanimous consent is given to pass this bill I will then ask unanimous consent to substitute the Senate bill 4151 for this bill. That bill has already passed the Senate, and it eliminates that part of the bill which is retroactive.

Mr. STAFFORD. So, then, the gentleman is in favor of striking out that provision of the bill which would make retroactive decisions as to realty?

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. I am perfectly willing to do that.

Mr. STAFFORD. I would like to ask the gentleman one further question, which relates to a different subject matter, and that is as to the provision authorizing the partition of real estate of Indians where an interest is owned by a restricted Indian.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. The situation is about this: The act of Congress approved May 28, 1908, undertook to confer jurisdiction for a complete settlement of inherited estates on the Oklahoma State courts. Now, the county courts constitute the probate courts of our State, but the Oklahoma laws specifically vest jurisdiction for partition in the district courts. This leaves us with no tribunal competent to partition inherited estates where the rights of one restricted heir is involved.

Many of these estates descend to both restricted and unrestricted heirs. The unrestricted heirs may be held up indefinitely by one restricted heir, their interests jeopardized, and their part of the estate made almost worthless.

Land buyers sometimes get undivided interests for much less than actual value because no valid title can be made. The gentleman can understand how havoc can be played with titles, values, and legitimate development under such unsatisfactory and indefinite procedure as that existing now.

Mr. STAFFORD. Are there many instances where the land is owned exclusively by restricted Indians?

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Where the inherited estates are owned exclusively by restricted Indians?

Mr. STAFFORD. Where the inherited estates descend to heirs who are exclusively, or a major portion of them, restricted Indians?

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. That is true in some cases, but in many cases the inherited estate descends to both restricted and unrestricted heirs. An exception to that, of course, would be the immediate descendants, the children of the deceased persons, both of whom fall in the restricted class. Where there are no children, then the gentleman can see that the descent might go to unrestricted as well as restricted Indians. And in some cases you will find that the sons and daughters of a father may some of them be restricted and some unrestricted, because some are the children of an Indian mother and others the children of a white woman.

Mr. STAFFORD. Then the gentleman has no question that this provision will not work any injury to the rights of the restricted Indians, but will be beneficial to them?

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. It will not be injurious to the restricted Indians and it will work great benefit to the unrestricted Indians.

Mr. STAFFORD. I can understand how it will work great benefit to the unrestricted Indians in case among the heirs at law there are but one or two restricted Indians, because the sale of the interest in the real estate in which he owns an undivided share is forbidden. Will the gentleman inform the House what is the present method of the determination of heirships among the Indians of the Five Civilized Tribes?

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Full-blood Indians?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. There is at present no procedure for the determination of heirship. There is no such thing as a final determination of the heirship of full-blooded Indian heirs in the Five Civilized Tribes.

Mr. STAFFORD. This first section of the bill endeavors to provide a method of the determination of that heirship?

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. So far as I am concerned, I have no objection to the consideration of the bill.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the gentleman from Oklahoma if the Senate bill which he suggested he would offer as a substitute contains the language which Mr. Secretary Lane, in a letter of March 16, 1918, to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. CARTER], said he would like to see incorporated in House bill 10590?

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Yes; if the gentleman will look at the report, he will see that the language is as follows:

Provided, That an appeal may be taken in the manner and to the court provided by law in cases of appeal in probate matters generally.

That is contained in the Senate bill.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Yes; but that other language, which I see is in the House bill in accordance with the suggestion of the Secretary of the Interior, is that in the Senate bill? This is the language to which I refer:

That the lands of full-blood members of any of the Five Civilized Tribes are hereby made subject to the laws of the State of Oklahoma providing for the partition of real estate. Any land allotted in such

proceedings to a full-blood Indian, or conveyed to him upon his election to take the same at the appraisal, shall remain subject to all restrictions upon alienation and taxation obtaining prior to such partition. In case of a sale under any decree or partition the conveyance thereunder shall operate to relieve the land described of all restrictions of every character.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. That is in the bill as passed by the Senate, which I will have read if we get unanimous consent for consideration.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I notice that is contained in the letter of the Secretary of the Interior to which I refer, and he says that he recommends the enactment of the House bill if it is amended in accordance with this particular suggestion.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. The amendments are carried in the Senate bill.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Is there any other language in the Senate bill which will at all contradict these amendments?

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. The only provision placed in the Senate bill which is not in the House bill is down in the middle of section 1, and is this language:

But this provision shall not be construed to reopen the question of the determination of an heirship already ascertained by competent legal authority under existing law.

That has been added in the Senate bill, I understand, at the suggestion of the department.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. That particular clause would not in any way affect the two amendments suggested by the Secretary?

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. No; it would not.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Which are incorporated in the bill?

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. It would not affect them.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. STAFFORD. Since I last addressed the gentleman my attention has been called by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HUDDLESTON] to a decision rendered by the Supreme Court of the United States to-day which passes upon the question of the heirship or title to lands of Indians of the Five Civilized Tribes. Of course, the gentleman can not be acquainted with the scope of that opinion, and I think perhaps in view of that decision it might be well to let this bill be passed over temporarily, to see just what the scope of the decision of the Supreme Court is.

Mr. HASTINGS. If the gentleman will permit, this bill deals with procedure. I think the decision of the Supreme Court, from what I hear, only deals with the rights of the heirs. This bill, as the gentleman understands, deals with the method of determining the heirs and not what the rights of the heirs are. The decision of the Supreme Court did not deal with that question nor could it deal with section 2 giving the district courts of Oklahoma jurisdiction where, in the decision of Coleman against Battiest, it was held under existing law our Supreme Court did not have jurisdiction. So the passage of this bill could not possibly do any damage. Let me say to the gentleman, while I am on my feet, that this bill is recommended by the Secretary of the Interior, it is recommended by the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs, and it has been passed by the Senate, and recommended by the House Committee on Indian Affairs, and there is no opposition to it.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. And it has been requested by the Federal land bank at Wichita, Kans.

Mr. STAFFORD. I know the influences back of the bill, and I recognize the need, but I thought it might be better to postpone it in order that we might get acquainted with the decision of the Supreme Court.

Mr. HASTINGS. I think, as I have said, that the decision of the Supreme Court only deals with the rights and not with the method of determining the heirs.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. And the question of there not being a procedure for the determination of the heirs has been passed upon by the Supreme Court long ago. We have no way of determining the heirs unless this bill is passed.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I notice as the bill was originally introduced it provided that in the determination of questions of fact as to who were the heirs the decision of the probate court in the State of Oklahoma conducted in the manner provided by the laws of the State for the determination of heirship should be conclusive of the question, and then I observe that the House committee inserted a proviso:

That an appeal may be taken in the manner and to the court provided by law, in cases of appeal in probate matters generally.

That is an exceedingly important proviso.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. That is in the Senate bill. The Senate placed it in this bill; and if the gentleman will permit me, the original bill from which the gentleman is reading was

introduced at the suggestion of the attorney for the Federal land bank at Wichita, Kans. He simply sent the bill to me, and I introduced it; it was sent in the regular course to the Secretary of the Interior, and the Secretary suggested certain changes, every one of which has been adopted in the bill reported and in the bill as passed by the Senate.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. The gentleman will see that if Congress should enact a law and say that the decision of the probate court in Oklahoma shall bar any attempt at an appeal—

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. I think what the gentleman says is very important, and I was glad the Secretary called my attention to it, so we put it in the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill S. 4151 on the Speaker's table be considered in lieu of the House bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oklahoma asks unanimous consent that the Senate bill 4151 be substituted for the House bill. Is there objection?

Mr. WALSH. Reserving the right to object, did I understand the gentleman to say that this bill was on the Speaker's table?

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. The Senate bill is on the Speaker's table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to taking the Senate bill from the Speaker's table and substituting it for the House bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oklahoma asks unanimous consent to consider this bill in the House as in Committee of the Whole. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That a determination of the question of fact as to who are the heirs of any deceased citizen allottee of the Five Civilized Tribes of Indians who may die or may have heretofore died, leaving restricted heirs, by the probate court of the State of Oklahoma having jurisdiction to settle the estate of said deceased, conducted in the manner provided by the laws of said State for the determination of heirship in closing up the estates of deceased persons, shall be conclusive of said question: *Provided*, That an appeal may be taken in the manner and to the court provided by law in cases of appeal in probate matters generally: *Provided further*, That where the time limited by the laws of said State for the institution of administration proceedings has elapsed without their institution, as well as in cases where there exists no lawful ground for the institution of administration proceedings in said courts, a petition may be filed therein having for its object a determination of such heirship and the case shall proceed in all respects as if administration proceedings upon other proper grounds had been regularly begun, but this proviso shall not be construed to reopen the question of the determination of an heirship already ascertained by competent legal authority under existing laws: *Provided further*, That said petition shall be verified, and in all cases arising hereunder service by publication may be had on all unknown heirs, the service to be in accordance with the method of serving nonresident defendants in civil suits in the district courts of said State; and if any person so served by publication does not appear and move to be heard within six months from the date of the final order, he shall be concluded equally with parties personally served or voluntarily appearing.

Sec. 2. That the lands of full-blood members of any of the Five Civilized Tribes are hereby made subject to the laws of the State of Oklahoma providing for the partition of real estate. Any land allotted in such proceedings to a full-blood Indian, or conveyed to him upon his election to take the same at the appraisalment, shall remain subject to all restrictions upon alienation and taxation obtaining prior to such partition. In case of a sale under any decree, or partition, the conveyance thereunder shall operate to relieve the land described of all restrictions of every character.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

The bill H. R. 10590, to provide for a determination of heirship in cases of deceased members of the Cherokee, Choctaw, Chickasaw, Creek, and Seminole Tribes of Indians in Oklahoma, conferring jurisdiction upon district courts to partition lands belonging to full-blood heirs of allottees of the Five Civilized Tribes, and for other purposes, was laid on the table.

NUMBERING AND RECORDING OF UNDOCUMENTED VESSELS.

The next bill on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill S. 1549, an act to require numbering and recording of undocumented vessels.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

Mr. STAFFORD. Reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman what is the necessity for the United States

taking jurisdiction of these motor-propelled boats, 16 feet in length and over, whether they have a permanent or a detachable motor, as this bill proposes to do?

Mr. ALEXANDER. We have two hundred and fifty or three hundred thousand motor boats plying in different waters, chiefly on the Atlantic coast, which are not numbered, and there are no means for identification. It is important to identify them, first, for the purposes of taxation, and, second, if they violate the rules of the road.

The statute of 1910 provides that all motor boats shall have lights, life preservers, whistles, means for extinguishing burning gasoline, and shall comply with the rules of the road for navigable waters. There is no lack of legislation to secure safety in respect of these boats. But it often happens that the parties operating craft of this character take advantage of the difficulty of detecting infractions of the statutes, and in defiance of the laws cross the bows of large steamers, greatly interfering thereby with the navigation of these vessels. Further, they cross the bows of other motor boats, and in still other ways violate the regulations of the police laws, to the very great danger of all concerned. Frequently they disregard the regulations relating to lighting after sunset, and leave their boats in dangerous places without anchor lights. The inspectors are continually confronted with violations of this character, but in many instances are unable to trace the guilty parties.

After we became involved in the war, as a military measure, the Navy Department undertook to enforce a rule of this kind as a protection to our naval vessels and merchant ships on the eastern coast, but they found they had no power to do so. This legislation is shown to be necessary in view of what has been stated on the floor to-day, that the German submarines are active in our waters. It will be a means of identifying the motor boat so that we may know the ownership and identify the boat, whether it is operated by an enemy alien or some other one inimical to our interests. That is a reason in addition to the reasons that have been assigned in the committee report.

The only objection ever made against numbering motor boats was because some of the owners of the high-class boats thought that to place numbers on them would disfigure them. But there is now no objection from any source whatever so far as I am advised.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman permit me to state an additional reason why this is proper legislation? In many sections of the country fishermen owning these boats leave the waters of their own State and fish in foreign jurisdictions and if they there violate the State laws there is no way of identifying or tracing them. This would permit that.

Mr. ALEXANDER. And oftentimes the boats are stolen, and it is impossible to identify them. It is just like letting automobiles go about the streets of our cities without any method of identifying them.

Mr. STAFFORD. When I read the bill and the report it occurred to me it was unnecessarily placing under Government regulation fishing motor boats and other larger craft and exacting from them a license tax of \$10 a year merely under the guise of regulation.

Mr. ALEXANDER. This does not carry any tax whatever.

Mr. WALSH. Ten dollars is the penalty.

Mr. ALEXANDER. The only expense is to put the numbers on the boats and the owner has to report to the collector of the port.

Mr. WALSH. That \$10 is the penalty.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Yes; for violating the law.

Mr. STAFFORD. I gained the impression from reading the report, which was nearly a month ago, that all of these vessels would have to pay a license.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Oh, no.

Mr. STAFFORD. If they were enrolled as required by the bill.

Mr. ALEXANDER. No.

Mr. CHARLES B. SMITH. Does this act apply to the inland waters of the United States?

Mr. ALEXANDER. All of the navigable waters of the United States where motor boats are used.

Mr. CHARLES B. SMITH. I would like to say to the gentleman that the members of the Motorboat Club of Buffalo have written to me objecting to the bill. The club itself has not objected, but I wondered if there is any burden placed upon them that should not be put on motor boats in the Great Lakes.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Not at all. There is no expense attached except in the placing of the numbers on the boats. It is simply a means of identification. It is of the utmost importance now, if never before, in view of the presence of enemy submarines off our coasts and for the reasons I have already given.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] and the chairman of the committee say that this bill would not require any additional tax. I direct their attention to the report. Perhaps I read it erroneously. It says:

It will aid the Treasury Department in the collection of the taxes imposed on pleasure boats of a certain character by section 603 of the act of October 3, 1917. As it is, the department finds great difficulty in locating the boats subject to this tax.

Mr. WALSH. That is another tax altogether.

Mr. ALEXANDER. That is another tax entirely. If the motor boats are liable to that tax under existing law, this simply helps to identify the boat and enables the Government to trace the owner.

Mr. STAFFORD. Personally I do not think we should try to regulate motor boats in all of our inland streams and on the Great Lakes. There may be necessity during the war to have a bill like this, especially in view of the present exigency of submarines appearing on the Atlantic coast, but for the National Government to take charge of the regulation of all motor boats on the inland streams, wherever navigable, I think it is going quite far.

Mr. ALEXANDER. The statute of 1910 provides that all motor boats shall have lights, life preservers, means of extinguishing burning gasoline, and so forth. We do not impose any additional burden upon them here except to say that they shall be numbered, and that is for the purpose of identification.

Mr. LEHLBACH. There is no objection to the numbering of these motor boats that can not with equal force be urged against the licensing and numbering of automobiles, and nothing can be said for licensing and numbering automobiles that can not with equal force be said for motor boats. The only reason the Federal Government has to do this is because it has control of all navigable waters of the United States.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman advances a good argument in favor of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That every undocumented vessel, operated in whole or in part by machinery, owned in the United States and found on the navigable waters thereof, except public vessels, and vessels not exceeding 16 feet in length measured from end to end over the deck, excluding sheer, temporarily equipped with detachable motors, shall be numbered. Such numbers shall be not less in size than 3 inches and painted or attached to each bow of the vessel in such manner and color as to be distinctly visible and legible.

Sec. 2. That the said numbers, on application of the owner or master, shall be awarded by the collector of customs of the district in which the vessel is owned and a record thereof kept in the customhouse of the district in which the owner or managing owner resides. No numbers not so awarded shall be carried on the bows of such vessel.

Sec. 3. That notice of destruction or abandonment of such vessels or change in their ownership shall be furnished within 10 days by the owners to the collectors of customs of the districts where such numbers were awarded. Such vessel sold into another customs district may be numbered anew in the latter district.

Sec. 4. That the penalty for violation of any provision of this act shall be \$10, for which the vessel shall be liable and may be seized and proceeded against in the district court of the United States in any district in which such vessel may be found. Such penalty on application may be mitigated or remitted by the Secretary of Commerce.

Sec. 5. That the Secretary of Commerce shall make such regulations as may be necessary to secure proper execution of this act by collectors of customs and other officers of the Government.

Sec. 6. That this act shall take effect six months after its passage.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the Senate bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. ALEXANDER, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

QUESTION OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of personal privilege in connection with an article published about me in the St. Louis Republic under date of May 25, 1918.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his question of personal privilege.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. It is because of the headlines placed over an article, which I send to the Clerk's desk and ask to have read.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

The shameful record of Congressman SHACKLEFORD.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Speaker, the St. Louis Republic is waging against me and other Missouri Congressmen a campaign of such vindictiveness and falsehood that I feel I owe it to myself and to the public to make some reply.

It opened the assault of May 25 in an article entitled "The shameful record of Mr. SHACKLEFORD." To justify that malignant headline it set out numerous specifications, some of which are wholly untrue.

It charges that I did not vote for conscription. Technically that charge is true, but the publishers of the Republic knew that I favored conscription; that at the time the vote was taken I was absent from Washington for a week or so at the advice of my doctor on account of sickness; that I did not go away, however, until I had been assured by those having the conscription bill in charge that there was no doubt of its passage. One way to tell a falsehood is to conceal a part of the truth. The Republic chose that method.

It charges that before war had been declared I opposed administration measures of preparedness. That is another falsehood. I defy the Republic to point to a single vote cast by me against any measure of preparedness advocated by President Wilson.

It charges that I was sponsor for the McLeMore resolution warning Americans not to travel on armed ships of the warring nations. That charge is also false. I had a large part in framing the report of the Committee on Foreign Affairs against the McLeMore resolution. When the resolution came up in the House I voted to lay it on the table and kill it. This is shown by the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 7, 1916, on page 3720.

Why has the Republic resorted to the publication of these several false charges against me? There can be but one answer. It was moved by a wrongful desire to inflict injury.

The Republic having thus willfully misrepresented me it is fair to assume that it will continue its policy of falsification. The people, however, will doubtless judge its future utterances by its past record and not require me to follow up and expose every untruth it may publish from now until the election. They will probably keep in mind the instruction which the judge sometimes gives to the jury, that if they find any witness has testified falsely on any material matter they may disregard all of his testimony.

In further justification of its characterization of my record as "shameful," the Republic makes some other charges which may be briefly noticed.

It is charged that I voted for the Stone resolution, declaring a state of war with Austria-Hungary. That statement is not quite correct. It was not the Stone resolution for which I voted, but a resolution from the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, of which I was a member. I assisted in the preparation of that resolution and voted for it in the House. It went to the Senate and was there concurred in. The President had asked for the passage of this resolution and was satisfied with its form. What is there in my action on this measure to make my record "shameful"?

The Republic charges that I voted for the prohibition and woman suffrage amendments. I did vote for resolutions referring these proposed amendments to the States to be ratified or rejected by them as they may choose. What was there in either of these votes to render my record "shameful"?

The Republic charges that I voted against the bill which would have "forced" the President to send Col. Roosevelt to France in command of a division of the American Army. That charge is true. The President was Commander in Chief of the Army. It was his duty to appoint officers to command under him. He was responsible for the conduct of the war, and I felt it would be out of place for Congress to dictate to him in that matter. What was there in my action on that measure to render my record "shameful"?

The Republic says that I am an astute politician; that I rarely speak on the floor of the House; but that I play a prominent part in committee meetings and am regarded as an especially aggressive worker in cloakrooms, where many a bill has been put across or killed long before final action was taken on the floor. I should hardly claim that much for myself, but if it be true it simply shows that I have the friendship and the confidence of other Congressmen and that I am able to exercise influence with them. Would it be a good policy for the district to change a Congressman with such capacity and influence for a new and an untried man? Is there anything in this characterization of me to render my record "shameful"?

If the Republic sets itself up as a dictator of Missouri politics then we have a right to ask that it should be truthful and honest in its dictatorship.

On the morning of the last election the Republic had an editorial containing the following words:

Woodrow Wilson has given us the greatest administration since Lincoln, because the President and Congress have worked constructively together. Our lawmakers have had vision, conscience, insight. The election of a Congress prepared to continue this service to the Nation and to mankind is just as important as the election of the President himself.

Missouri expects every man to do his duty to-day by voting for Senator REED and the Democratic congressional ticket.

On November 6, the day before the last election, the Republic had another editorial from which I quote:

The Congress of the past four years has set a new mark in efficiency in legislation.

Missouri takes deep satisfaction in the highly honorable and conspicuously important part by the Missouri delegation at Washington in the new legislation enacted to meet new needs of a new day. No one can recount the history of this epochal period and leave out the achievements of Missourians in the high places of responsibility in the National Legislature.

These two editorials were words of high praise of me and the other Missourians. Both of these editorials were published more than eight months after the McLemore resolution incident of which the Republic now complains. Were these complimentary editorials honest expressions of the opinion of the Republic? If so, then its contrary expressions now are not honest.

The Republic claims that it is inspired to make these malevolent attacks on me and other Missouri Congressmen by a spirit of patriotism, but its record proves this to be untrue. Patriotism never inspired anybody to stir up strife and differences among the American people in an hour of danger like this. Patriotism never inspired anybody to utter falsehoods about any public man for the purpose of undermining the confidence of the public in him. What then has moved the Republic to its policy of vituperation? In my judgment there are three moving causes for it.

In the first place the Republic has never been as prosperous as its owners would like. It has not kept pace in circulation with the Globe-Democrat, its great rival. Consequently its advertising columns do not draw the volume of business nor command the prices therefor that is desired. The managers of the Republic, recognizing the splendid spirit of patriotism that pervades the country have undertaken to capitalize it for a larger circulation. They hope to do this by assuming a "holier-than-thou" attitude.

Again, the Republic and other large newspapers and magazines have for years been going through the mails at very much less than the cost of carriage. This loss to the Government now amounts to something like \$80,000,000 a year. When we came to make up the war-tax bill in the last Congress we took part of this subsidy away from the publishers. I and other Missouri Congressmen actively supported this measure. Its passage largely increased the amount of postage which the Republic has to pay the Government. Naturally, the Republic does not look kindly on any of us who increased its taxes. It wants to defeat us, but can not afford to state its real reason and so resorts to such subterfuges as the McLemore resolution, failure to support the bill to send Roosevelt to France, and so forth.

Then, too, the Republic is one of those papers, of which happily there are not many, that professes loyalty to one party and sells its columns to the other. [Applause.] To provide itself with a plausible excuse for such conduct it is probably now paving the way by attacking those Democrats who are likely to be nominated.

In the last campaign, when the Democratic Party had one of the hardest struggles of its existence, the Republic sold its columns to the support of Judge Hughes. On each of the last six days before the election there was carried in the Republic nearly a whole page statement of reasons why Wilson should be defeated and Hughes elected. The Republican campaign committee paid the Republic large sums for this service. The Republic sold its space to get money. The Republican committee bought it to get votes for Hughes. That committee was made up of wise men, who knew what they were doing. They were not throwing their money away, but were putting it where it would do the most good. Nobody can doubt that in Missouri Wilson's vote was made smaller and Hughes's larger by this shameful sale of the columns of this Democratic daily. Had Hughes carried Missouri, he would have won the election.

On those days of the campaign when this great Democratic paper was selling its space to the Hughes committee I and other Democratic Congressmen who are now being vilified and misrepresented by it were in the campaign holding up the flag of Democracy and rallying the voters to the support of Wilson. Is it not strange that in the face of that record the Republic should now in the house of our fathers challenge me and these other Missouri Democrats?

In the same issue of the Republic which carried the vituperation and the slanderous article to which I have referred there was an editorial, from which I quote:

There is probably not one man in this Congress who would now favor legislation intended to restrict the war activity of the country to a limit below the utmost that can be done.

If that statement be true, and it is, then why keep up a fight on these Congressmen? They are very busy with their country's business. Why disturb them and compel them to take the time

to look after their own affairs and defend their reputations against the false charges of sinister newspapers?

On May 28 the Republic had another editorial, from which I will quote:

This is no time for fights between American leaders. There is only one enemy, and if there is any American who is impairing his usefulness to the country as a whole by having a feud with any other American he falls short of the full duty of American citizenship.

I commend these words of the Republic to its managers. This is no time to stir up strife between Americans. We should all stand together and win the war. The Republic has said that there is not a man in Congress who would not go to the last limit for victory. Then why malign and harass them? Why not leave their minds free to give their country their best service? The situation is serious. Our boys are going by the hundreds of thousands. They should have, and should be made to feel that they have, a united country behind them. It must discourage them to know that people at home have lost sight of them in a struggle to put some men out of Congress simply to make room for others to get in.

I assure the Republic that everybody here is loyal and will do his best. Then why not forget past differences and stand together in supporting the flag which we all so dearly love?

Oh, the shame of the St. Louis Republic! [Applause.]

GEORGIA EXPERIMENT STATION.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was House joint resolution 231, authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to certify to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment, and the Secretary of the Treasury to pay, the appropriation for the Georgia Experiment Station, of the State of Georgia, under act of March 4, 1917, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, to the board of trustees of the Agricultural and Mechanical College of the State of Georgia, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, provision for substantially the same purpose as this is carried in the Agricultural appropriation bill, which has been agreed to in a partial conference report. Therefore I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin objects, and the resolution is stricken from the calendar.

INDIANHEAD RAILROAD.

The next business in order on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 6982) to authorize and empower the Secretary of the Navy to enter into and contract for the construction of a line of railway from a point in the District of Columbia to Indianhead, Md.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, this bill has already passed the House and is now on the Speaker's table, having been returned by the Senate with Senate amendments. This bill is erroneously on this calendar, and therefore I object.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks the gentleman has the wrong bill. The Speaker asks the Clerk to pass the one the gentleman is talking about.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is this the Indianhead bill? Mr. Speaker, this bill has been substantially incorporated in the amendment in the naval appropriation bill, and under the circumstances I do not think we should act upon it here, but await the action of the conferees on that amendment. Therefore I object.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, it is my recollection, which I am sure is accurate, that this bill here pending was inserted as a paragraph in the naval bill. Before the paragraph was reached during the consideration of that bill it was criticized here, and thereupon the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs [Mr. PADGETT], the gentleman from Tennessee, asked leave to withdraw the paragraph and it was withdrawn, he at the same time saying that he understood that the Pennsylvania Railroad was going to build this proposed line of track. I therefore object to its consideration at this time.

The SPEAKER. Both the gentlemen from Wisconsin object, and the bill is ordered stricken from the calendar.

PUBLIC-BUILDING SITE AT FARIBAULT, MINN.

The next business in order on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 3332) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to sell and convey certain land to the city of Faribault, Minn.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to sell to the city of Faribault, Minn., at a proper price and upon such terms as he may deem to be to the best interests of the United States, that portion of the Federal building site in said city described as follows: The west 16 feet of lots 1 and 2 of block 46, of the original town (now city) of Faribault, Minn., for public alley purposes; to convey said land to said city by the usual quitclaim deed, and to deposit the proceeds of such sale in the Treasury of the United States as a miscellaneous receipt.

The SPEAKER. This bill is on the Union Calendar.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read the third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. STAFFORD, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

PAYMENT FOR LEGAL SERVICES RENDERED TO THE CREEK NATION.

The next business in order on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 906) making an appropriation to Stuart, Lewis, Gordon & Rutherford in payment of legal services rendered by them to the Creek Nation.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. The bill is stricken from the calendar.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman reserve his right to object for a moment?

Mr. WALSH. I will.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman agree that the bill go to the foot of the calendar?

Mr. WALSH. Certainly.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed without prejudice and go to the foot of the calendar.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma asks to pass the bill without prejudice and same to go to the foot of the calendar. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

BRIDGE ACROSS MAHONING RIVER, OHIO.

The next business in order on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 10021) granting the consent of Congress to the county commissioners of Trumbull County, Ohio, to construct, operate, and maintain a bridge and approaches thereto across the Mahoning River in the State of Ohio.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the county commissioners of Trumbull County, Ohio, to construct, maintain, and operate, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, a bridge and approaches thereto across the Mahoning River, near the city of Niles, in the township of Weathersfield, in the county of Trumbull, State of Ohio, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

The committee amendment was read, as follows:

Page 2, line 4, insert a new section, section 2, as follows:

"That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE TENNESSEE RIVER NEAR LOUDON, TENN.

The next business in order on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 10818) to authorize the county of Loudon, in the State of Tennessee, to construct a bridge across the Tennessee River near Loudon, Tenn.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. AUSTIN] is sick and sent the Chair word that he would like to have this bill passed without prejudice.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have the bill passed without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks that the bill be passed without prejudice. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. FOSTER. Does that take it to the foot of the calendar?

Mr. STAFFORD. In view of the circumstances, I do not think it would, the gentleman from Tennessee being ill.

APPEALS FROM DECISIONS OF BOARDS OF LOCAL INSPECTORS OF VESSELS.

The next business in order on the Unanimous Consent Calendar was the bill (S. 1544) to provide for appeals from decisions of boards of local inspectors of steam vessels, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I think some explanation should be made as to the purpose to be accomplished by this bill.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, the language of this bill in the form in which it was reported from the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries is identical, I think, with the bill that passed the House in the last Congress but failed to pass the Senate. It was framed with a view of meeting conditions growing out of the *Eastland* disaster. Under existing law there is no appeal provided by law from the decision of local inspectors. This bill does no more than provide that appeal may be made either by officers named or by some one directly interested from the local inspector to the supervising inspector and from the supervising inspector to the Supervising Inspector General, and it is better to enforce our navigation laws and fix the responsibility to the public of those who may be negligent in the discharge of their duties and jeopardize or cause the loss of human life and at the same time protect those who may be unjustly convicted of an offense by providing for appeal. On page 3 of the report the Secretary of Commerce sets out a number of cases where there were accidents and where the masters of the vessels were convicted before the board of local inspectors but punished nominally, although the offense was very grave, and yet there was no appeal from their decision.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, do I understand this permits the Department of Commerce to appeal also from the decision of its own inspectors?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Yes. Now, it says:

That whenever any person directly interested in or affected by any decision or action by any board of local inspectors of vessels shall feel aggrieved by such decision or action he may appeal therefrom to the supervising inspector of the district, and a like appeal shall be allowed from any decision or action of a supervising inspector to the Supervising Inspector General, whose decision, when approved by the Secretary of Commerce, shall be final.

Mr. WALSH. Yes; I noticed the language to which the gentleman has directed my attention, but the gentleman cited cases where accidents had occurred or disasters and parties in charge of vessels had had the case investigated by local boards of inspectors and the sentence inflicted was very light, although the offense was great.

Now, if this bill becomes a law, as I read that language, the navigation department of the Department of Commerce—

Mr. ALEXANDER. The Steamboat-Inspection Service.

Mr. WALSH. The Steamboat-Inspection Service could not appeal from that decision, with a view of having the case reviewed and a more severe penalty being imposed.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I call the gentleman's attention to the second section, that says:

That whenever there shall be a disagreement between the local inspectors in regard to any matter before them for decision they shall report the case to the supervising inspector of the district, who shall investigate and decide the same; and any supervising inspector may within 30 days thereafter, upon his own motion, review any decision or action of any board of local inspectors within his district, and in like manner the Supervising Inspector General may within 30 days thereafter review any decision or action of any supervising inspector or board of local inspectors, and the decision of the Supervising Inspector General in such case shall, when approved by the Secretary of Commerce, be final.

Mr. WALSH. That is only in case there is a dissenting opinion, so to speak, filed by one of the local inspectors.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Not only where there is a difference of opinion, but from any decision of the local inspectors.

Mr. WALSH. Now, there may be cases, and are cases, I have no doubt, where the local inspectors impose nominal penalties upon persons who are responsible for accidents, and it is done unanimously, and yet something may occur later to show that a more severe penalty should have been imposed. The only way it can be imposed, if this bill should become a law, is in case there is a disagreement between the local inspectors. Now, does not the gentleman think, with this measure, which is urged to perfect the navigation laws, with the right of review on the part of the Steamboat-Inspection Service of the Department of Commerce, that they ought to have the right to reopen and investigate these cases without the necessity of their being a disagreement amongst the local inspectors?

Mr. EDMONDS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I think the language will do that. I call the gentleman's attention to the language beginning in line 13 on page 2:

Any supervising inspector may within 30 days thereafter, upon his own motion, review any decision or action of any board of local inspectors within his district.

That is so, whether it is a unanimous or divided opinion.

Mr. WALSH. That seems to be hooked up with the early part of the section.

Mr. ALEXANDER. And then again it says:

The Supervising Inspector General may within 30 days thereafter review any decision or action of any supervising inspector or board of local inspectors.

Mr. WALSH. That all seems to be hooked up with the first part of the section.

Mr. EDMONDS. I would like to call attention to the fact that it is upon his own motion.

Mr. LEHLBACH. There are two propositions. One is that in case of disagreement they shall report it. And it goes on to say that on his own motion the supervising inspector may.

Mr. WALSH. The language is clear, I will admit, but it is hooked up with the earlier part of the section by a semicolon, and it would seem to depend upon the disagreement.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I think it is quite clear that the supervising inspector in the first instance, and later on the Supervising Inspector General, on his own motion, may review any action of the local inspectors. The Supervising Inspector General may review any decision or action of the supervising inspector or board of local inspectors.

Mr. HARDY. The purpose of the framing of the language in the form in which it was to make it absolutely compulsory that if there was a division it should go up to higher authority. If there was no division, still the right of review existed in the higher authority.

Mr. WALSH. Of course, there would be no question—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. WALSH. Still further reserving the right to object, if this was started out as a new sentence then it would be clearer.

Mr. HARDY. The committee had it in mind, and they thought the semicolon would be sufficient to distinguish between the two.

Mr. WALSH. In view of the explanation of the gentlemen of the committee, who have given this careful attention, and in view of the great importance of the measure, I am willing to waive any doubt for the present I have as to the language, and I will not object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will read the bill.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ALEXANDER] asks unanimous consent that this bill be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

An act (S. 1544) to provide for appeals from decisions of boards of local inspectors of steam vessels, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted, etc., That whenever any person peculiarly interested in any decision or action of any board of local inspectors of steam vessels shall feel himself aggrieved by such decision or action, he may appeal therefrom to the supervising inspector of the district, and a like appeal shall be allowed from any decision or action of a supervising inspector to the Supervising Inspector General, whose decision, when approved by the Secretary of Commerce, shall be final: *Provided, however,* That application for such reexamination of the case by a supervising inspector or by the Supervising Inspector General shall be made within 30 days after the decision or action appealed from shall have been rendered or taken: *And provided further,* That in all cases reviewed under the provisions of this act where the issue is the suspension or revocation of the license of a licensed officer, such officer shall be allowed to be represented by counsel and to testify in his own behalf.

SEC. 2. That whenever there shall be a disagreement between the local inspectors in regard to any matter before them for decision, they shall report the case to the supervising inspector of the district, who shall investigate and decide the same, and any supervising inspector may, upon his own motion, review any decision or action of any board of local inspectors within his district, and in like manner the Supervising Inspector General may review any decision or action of any supervising inspector or board of local inspectors, and the decision of the Supervising Inspector General in such case shall, when approved by the Secretary of Commerce, be final.

SEC. 3. That any decision or action reviewed by the Supervising Inspector General or by any supervising inspector, as provided in section 1 of this act, may be revoked, changed, or modified by such reviewing officer, who shall have power to administer oaths, and to summon and compel the attendance of witnesses by a similar process as in the district courts of the United States; and the disbursing clerk, Department of Commerce, shall pay, on properly certified vouchers, such fees to any witness, so summoned, for his actual travel and attendance, as shall be officially certified to by the officer reviewing the case, not exceeding the rate allowed for fees to witnesses for travel and attendance in the district courts of the United States.

SEC. 4. That the Secretary of Commerce shall make such regulations as may be necessary to secure a proper enforcement of the provisions of this act.

SEC. 5. That section 4452 of the Revised Statutes, as amended by section 6 of the act of March 3, 1905, is hereby repealed.

Also, the following committee amendments were read:

Amend, line 3, page 1, by striking out the word "peculiarly" and inserting in lieu of the same the word "directly"; and after the word "in" insert the words "or affected by."

Amend, line 5, page 1, by striking out the word "himself."

Amend, line 7, page 1, by striking out the comma and inserting a semicolon after the word "district."

Amend, line 6, page 2, by striking out the comma after the word "officer."

Amend, line 11, page 2, by striking out the comma after the word "decision."

Amend, line 13, page 2, by striking out the comma after the word "same" and insert in lieu of the same a semicolon; and by striking out the comma after the word "may" and inserting thereafter the words "within 30 days thereafter."

Amend, line 15, page 2, by striking out the comma after the word "district."

Amend, line 17, page 2, by inserting after the word "may" the words "within 30 days thereafter."

Amend, line 24, page 2, by striking out the word "section" and inserting in lieu of the same the word "sections"; and after the word "one" insert the words "and two."

Amend, line 11, page 3, by striking out the comma after the word "oaths."

Amend, line 5, page 3, by striking out the comma after the word "witness" and by striking out the comma after the word "summoned."

Amend, line 5, page 3, by striking out the comma after the word "attendance."

Mr. WALSH. In reporting this amendment on page 2, line 13, the Clerk reported striking out the comma. There has been inserted there a semicolon, which, I assume, is the committee amendment.

Mr. ALEXANDER. The comma is stricken out and the semicolon placed there.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman just yield for a moment? I wish to ask his attention to the point raised a moment ago. Will the gentleman state when this 30 days begins to run or expire? It says:

And any supervising inspector may within 30 days thereafter.

Does that mean 30 days after they have reported the case to the supervising inspector of the district, or does it mean 30 days after they have investigated and decided the same?

Mr. ALEXANDER. It is after any decision by the board of local inspectors. They report those decisions.

Mr. WALSH. Then, of course, if it is after any decision by the supervising inspector, it would seem to me that the contention which I raised earlier is correct, that the supervising inspector can only open these cases on his own motion in case there is a disagreement in the local board, because that is the only time that it is reported to the supervising inspector.

Mr. ALEXANDER. No; they are reported, as I understand.

Mr. WALSH. I know; but it is the only time it is reported, when there is investigation and further report.

Mr. ALEXANDER. The decisions of the local inspectors, in any event, whether there is a disagreement or not, are reported to the supervising inspector.

Mr. WALSH. Yes; but the gentleman says that the 30 days begins after the supervising inspector has investigated and reported the case, as the result of the disagreement by the local board.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Of course, every decision calls for an investigation, but it is after the decision of the local board.

Mr. WALSH. I do not think the gentleman is correct there.

Mr. ALEXANDER. That is our intent. I think it is clear.

Mr. WALSH. I understood the gentleman to say it was 30 days after the investigation and decision of the supervising inspector of the district, then after the decision the supervising inspector of the district might reopen it on his own motion.

Mr. ALEXANDER. There is no appeal under the existing law from the decision of the local inspectors, and now we have undertaken to make it so. Not only in a case where there is a disagreement may their action be reviewed but also when they are in agreement. When the decision of the local inspectors is reported to the supervising inspector he may review that decision and reverse it if he thinks the facts warrant it, and although he may affirm it the Supervising Inspector General may himself review and reverse that decision. The purpose is to place the responsibility all along the line, from the Supervising Inspector General down to the local inspector, to avoid just such accidents as the *Eastland* disaster.

Mr. WALSH. Yes; I think it is important that we should do what the committee intends. Will the gentleman tell me when the "30 days thereafter" begins, that is set forth in line 17?

Mr. ALEXANDER. It reads, "may within 30 days thereafter review any decision or any action of any supervising inspector

or board of local inspectors." He does not have to wait for the action of the supervising inspector of the district. He may review the action of the local inspectors himself.

Mr. WALSH. Yes. But when does that 30 days expire?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Either after the decision of the local board of inspectors or in the other instance after the decision by the supervising inspector.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman give me five minutes more?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for five minutes more.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield there for a suggestion?

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

Mr. HARDY. I think there is a little misapprehension. I do not think the local inspectors make reports to the supervising inspector of the district of all their decisions. They make their decision, and it stands unless there is a division. If there is a division they are by this law required to report their action to the district supervising inspector. If not, their decision stands. But under this bill any supervisor can visit all these local boards and review all their decisions.

He can take it up on his own motion any time within 30 days after the rendering of any decision by the local board. Whether there is a division or not, the supervising inspector has the right to do it.

There are three different conditions provided for. One is where there is a division. In that case, they are required to report to the supervising inspector of the district. Then, if there is no division and the decision is unanimous, the district supervising inspector has the right of his own motion to review the decision and action of the local board. And, again, the Supervising Inspector General may, within 30 days thereafter, review any decision or action of the district supervising inspector. So that it provides for the taking up of these decisions, whether they are done by unanimous agreement or not, first by the supervising inspector of the district, and then, if the inspector general is dissatisfied with that, he goes on on his own motion. There is not much formality of appeal or report. This bill was intended to give to the supervising inspector of the district the right to go into the action of these local boards and see what they were doing and investigate and examine any decisions they might make.

Mr. WALSH. And a like right is given to the Inspector General?

Mr. HARDY. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. The point I make here is that under the language of the section, as framed, any supervising inspector may, within 30 days thereafter—

Mr. HARDY. What does that "thereafter" mean? "Upon his own motion he may review any decision or action of the board." Take that sentence by itself. "Any supervising inspector may within 30 days thereafter upon his own motion review any decision or action of any board of local inspectors within his district." We were attempting to make this grammatically correct and at the same time not very much alter the language that came to us from the Senate and also the language that was incorporated in the bill that the House passed last session and that went to the Senate and died by inaction there. I do not see but that "thereafter" can refer to but one predicate. It refers to any decision or action of the local board of inspectors.

Mr. WALSH. But it says when they are divided they shall report the case to the supervising inspector of the district, who shall investigate and decide the same; and then it says, "Any supervising inspector may within 30 days thereafter." Now, the natural inference given to that language would be that it would be 30 days after this supervising inspector had investigated and decided the case.

Mr. HARDY. I am as anxious as the gentleman from Massachusetts is to get it perfectly clear, and if we can find any words that will relieve any doubt, I shall be glad to adopt them.

Mr. WALSH. I do not desire to delay the passage of this important measure for the purpose of putting in any language which I propose. I do want to get the opinion of the members of the committee as to whether or not this language is susceptible of the meaning which they intend to convey, and if it would not be clearer to change the semicolon into a period and strike out the word "and" and capitalize the word "any" in line 13.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. HARDY. I ask that the gentleman may have five minutes longer.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Massachusetts be extended five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KING. Why not eliminate the period and semicolon and put an end to this controversy?

Mr. HARDY. I am trying to find what will make it clearer than it is. I think it might be made to read:

And any supervising inspector may, upon his own motion, review any decision or action of any board of local inspectors within his district within 30 days after the same is rendered or taken.

Mr. WALSH. Of course there would not be any doubt about that language.

Mr. HARDY. If he will offer that amendment we will accept it.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I desire to offer the following amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The committee amendments are first in order.

Mr. WALSH. I desire to offer this amendment as a substitute for the committee amendment when it is reached.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the first committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 1, line 3, strike out the word "pecuniarily" and insert in lieu thereof the word "directly."

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 4, at the beginning of the line insert the words "or affected by."

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all the committee amendments except the one in lines 13 and 14, on page 2, be acted upon in gross.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent that all the committee amendments to the bill, with the exception of the one in lines 13 and 14, on page 2, be agreed to in gross. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The other committee amendments were agreed to, as follows:

Page 1, line 4, insert "or affected by."

Amend, line 5, page 1, by striking out the word "himself."

Amend, line 7, page 1, by striking out the comma and inserting a semicolon after the word "district."

Amend, line 3, page 2, by striking out the comma after the word "office."

Amend, line 8, page 2, by striking out the comma after the word "decision."

Amend, line 10, page 2, by striking out the comma after the word "same" and insert in lieu of the same a semicolon; and by striking out the comma after the word "may" and inserting thereafter the words "within 30 days thereafter."

Amend, line 12, page 2, by striking out the comma after the word "district."

Amend, line 20, page 2, by striking out the word "section" and inserting in lieu of the same the word "sections"; and after the word "one" insert the words "and two."

Amend, line 22, page 2, by striking out the comma after the word "oaths."

Amend, line 1, page 3, by striking out the comma after the word "witness"; and by striking out the comma after the word "summoned."

Amend, line 2, page 3, by striking out the comma after the word "attendance."

Mr. WALSH. Now, Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment: On page 2, in line 13, strike out the semicolon and insert a period. Strike out the word "and" following the period and capitalize the word "any"; and then strike out the words in that line and in line 14, "within 30 days thereafter"; and after the word "district," in line 15, insert "within 30 days after the said decision or action has been rendered or taken," so that the language will read as follows:

Any supervising inspector may upon his own motion review any decision or action of any board of local inspectors within his district within 30 days after the said decision or action has been rendered or taken.

Mr. HARDY. Let me suggest to the gentleman that if he strikes out the semicolon, inserts a period, strikes out the word "and," and puts in a capital "A" for the word "any" the sentence will be plain. Then it could not refer back to the question of the report and would be perfectly clear. We will make no objection to it.

Mr. WALSH. If the gentleman will offer that as a substitute for my amendment, I will accept it.

Mr. HARDY. I offer as a substitute instead of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts, to strike out the semicolon after the word "same" and insert a period, strike out the word "and," and then begin the word "any" with a capital "A," so that it will read:

Any supervising inspector may, within 30 days thereafter, upon his own motion, review any decision or action of any board of local inspectors within his district.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HARDY: Page 2, line 13, after the word "same," strike out the semicolon and insert in lieu thereof a period. Strike out the word "and" and capitalize the letter "A" in "any."

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I will accept that substitute for the amendment which I offered.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, the gentleman from Massachusetts offered a substitute for the committee amendment. Now, he suggests that the gentleman from Texas offer a substitute for his substitute. I do not know of any parliamentary rule which makes that in order.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I understand the gentleman from Massachusetts desires to withdraw his amendment.

Mr. WALSH. I withdraw my amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts withdraws his amendment. The question is on the amendment which has been reported by the Clerk.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was accordingly read the third time and passed.

By unanimous consent, the title of the bill was amended so as to read: "An act to provide for appeals from decisions of boards of local inspectors of vessels, and for other purposes."

On motion of Mr. ALEXANDER, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

WOMAN SUFFRAGE IN HAWAII.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 2380) granting to the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii additional powers relative to elections and qualification of electors.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California moves to suspend the rules and pass the bill the title of which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Miss RANKIN. I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Is the lady from Montana opposed to this bill?

Miss RANKIN. No; I am in favor of it.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will recognize somebody who is opposed to it, if there is anybody, in accordance with the rule; otherwise the Chair will recognize the lady from Montana.

Mr. RAKER. I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks that a second be considered as ordered. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California is entitled to 20 minutes and the lady from Montana [Miss RANKIN] is entitled to 20 minutes.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, this bill passed the Senate on September 13, 1917, unanimously. I want to state that hearings on this bill were had before the Committee on Woman Suffrage of the House. A number of parties appeared, particularly Mrs. Benjamin F. Pittman, of Boston, who has been in Hawaii and is familiar with the situation there; also Mrs. Maud Wood Park, Dr. Anna Howard Shaw, and others.

After such hearings and full consideration by the committee the bill was reported out of the committee unanimously. There was and is no opposition in the committee to the bill. It simply gives the Hawaiian Legislature the power and the right to enact a law, if they see fit, or they may submit it to the citizens by the way of referendum, to say whether or not female suffrage shall be granted to the women of Hawaii. At this time I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

Mr. WALSH. Reserving the right to object, what is the use of reprinting this report?

Mr. RAKER. Because it is valuable and there is no other way of getting it into the RECORD. It contains valuable statements.

Mr. WALSH. The statements of Mrs. Maud Wood Park and Dr. Anna Howard Shaw and Mrs. Benjamin F. Pittman?

Mr. RAKER. Yes; and I think the statement of Mrs. Pittman is remarkable.

Mr. WALSH. Those statements are printed in full in the report, and it is a little unusual to reprint the reports in the RECORD.

Mr. RAKER. I was trying to save time instead of recapitulating them in my remarks. I want them to go to the House and to the country for the benefit of the country.

Mr. WALSH. I do not think the gentleman ought to reprint the reports in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. WALSH. I object.

Mr. GARNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAKER. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. GARNER. Was the Delegate from the Hawaiian Islands in favor of the bill?

Mr. RAKER. Yes; he wrote a letter to me personally and asked a meeting of the committee, and he sent a written statement, as he was called away on a subpoena to testify as a witness in an important case in Hawaii and could not be personally present.

Mr. GARNER. And the Delegate is in favor of the bill?

Mr. RAKER. He is not only in favor of it but he is anxious for its passage.

Under the organic act creating the Territory of Hawaii suffrage was confined to male citizens. This bill proposes to vest in the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii the "power to provide that in all elections authorized to be held by the organic act of the Territory of Hawaii female citizens possessing the same qualifications as male citizens shall be entitled to vote."

The bill also provides that the legislature "is further hereby vested with the power to have submitted to the voters of the Territory of Hawaii the question of whether or not the female citizens of the Territory shall be empowered to vote at elections held under the laws of the Territory of Hawaii." The proposal comes to the Congress of the United States from the people of Hawaii through the action of their Territorial legislature.

The measure is favored by both political parties of the islands, and there is indicated a large measure of popular interest in the granting of suffrage to the women of the Territory.

Since the organic law can only be changed by an act of Congress, the power necessary to make the needful changes so as to allow women to take part with men in the exercise of suffrage is by the bill vested in the Legislature of Hawaii, which can either of its own motion grant the rights of equal suffrage to all its citizens, subject to the other limitations of the organic act, or can provide for a referendum on the subject, or can do both. This statement of the facts of the case relieves the question from the suggestion that the Congress of the United States is forcing upon the people of the Territory of Hawaii a suffrage system which may be unwelcome to them. The request comes in the form of a petition from the representative body of the Territory, and further provision is made for a referendum vote. All that Congress is asked to do is to permit the legislature to grant the privilege of equal suffrage to the women of the Territory in the discretion of the legislative body itself.

The question of equal suffrage for the territory of Hawaii should be disassociated from the question as it affects the United States of America. Nevertheless it is pertinent to observe that the alternative method here recommended empowering the legislature to grant equal suffrage or submitting the matter to a referendum of the people are methods already in force in the States of the Union.

During the present year the Legislatures of North Dakota, Ohio, Rhode Island, Michigan, Nebraska, and Indiana have voted to grant presidential suffrage to the women of these States, while in Maine, Iowa, South Dakota, and Oklahoma the legislatures have referred the question of woman suffrage to the people.

Congress simply grants in this bill to the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii the power granted the State legislatures in the various State constitutions and by Congress in acts granting Territorial government. Porto Rico was granted that power in the recent bill providing for civil government in that island.

It is also proper to observe that the cause of woman suffrage has been tremendously advanced on account of the war conditions which now prevail over so large a part of the world. The women of England, for example, patriotically enlisting in every form of service except that of actual combat on the fields of battle, have so deeply impressed members of Parliament that

this long-deferred measure of justice has recently passed the House of Commons by an overwhelming majority. It then passed the House of Lords, and was approved by the King. The women of England now have full rights of suffrage, for which they have been struggling for so many years.

In other parts of the British Empire, in Australia, New Zealand, the six Provinces of Canada, and British Columbia, women possess equal rights with men; while in India, Burma, and British Honduras women have been granted municipal suffrage by the British Parliament. Finland, Norway, Denmark, and Iceland have granted equal suffrage, and Sweden every suffrage right except the vote for Parliament. Republican France has pledged to extend municipal suffrage to women in the immediate future. One of the States of Mexico, Yucatan, has granted suffrage to its women. As Mr. Asquith recently remarked:

"I no longer regard this question from the standpoint we occupied before the war. Women have worked out their own salvation. I am ready to give them the vote."

It has been deemed advisable to remove the source of discontent and disunion by rewarding the tremendous share of women in the labors and sacrifices incident to a state of war.

An act of Congress, therefore, empowering the Legislature of Hawaii to remove one restriction of the organic act or to submit the question to a referendum of the voters will be in line with many precedents that have been established during the period of the great war.

Ever since Jefferson declared as the foundation of our liberties the principle that "Governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed," it has become apparent that equal suffrage is inevitable not only in America but throughout the world.

It is worthy of note that the House of Representatives on January 10, 1918, by the constitutional two-thirds vote passed H. J. Res. 200.

The premier of Italy, last week, said that he feels the time has come for the extension of full suffrage to the women of Italy, and that he trusts that the Italian Parliament will immediately pass the measure granting woman suffrage in Italy.

Within the last two months the great Lone Star State of Texas has given primary suffrage to the women of Texas. The bill should pass without a dissenting vote.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Miss RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that everyone in the House who voted for woman suffrage on January 10 last is in favor of this bill. It merely gives the Legislature of Hawaii the right to decide whether or not they shall give woman suffrage to the women of Hawaii, or submit it to the voters. I believe that the women in Hawaii are just as anxious for another step in democracy as are the women all over America and every country in the world. We are fighting this war for democracy, and democracy does not come in any one step; it comes by all the people taking the steps that are before them, and this is one of the steps toward a fuller democracy. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill.

The question was taken; and two-thirds having voted in favor thereof, the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

PENSIONS.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill H. R. 3547, with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 3547) to extend the provisions of the pension act of May 11, 1912, to the officers and enlisted men of all State militia and other State organizations that rendered service to the Union cause during the Civil War for a period of 90 days or more, and providing pensions for their widows, minor children, and dependent parents, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted etc., That the provisions, limitations, and benefits of an act entitled "An act granting pensions to certain enlisted men, soldiers, and officers, who served in the Civil War and the War with Mexico," approved May 11, 1912, be and the same are hereby extended to include any person not an enlisted soldier in the Army, serving for the time being as a member of the militia of any State, or as a member of any other State organization, under orders of an officer of the United States, or who volunteered for the time being to serve with any regularly organized military or naval force of the United States, and who actually rendered a service of 90 days or more in any of the said military organizations during said war, and who were honorably discharged therefrom or otherwise honorably relieved from duty under the order of proper military authority.

Sec. 2. That the widows, minor children, and dependent parents of those provided for in section 1 of this act shall be entitled to the same pensions as are now provided by law for the widows, minor children, and dependent parents of the soldiers who were in the regular service during the Civil War.

Sec. 3. That the Secretary of the Interior shall prescribe rules and regulations governing the character of evidence necessary to prove the service herein set forth: *Provided*, That a certificate of the adjutant general of the State to which the military organizations belonged, showing the date of honorable discharge therefrom, shall be accepted

in lieu of the honorable discharge required by the provisions of the act referred to in section 1: *And provided further*, That the provisions of this act shall not extend to the case of any person wherein the evidence discloses any fact that would have barred him from an honorable discharge had he been in the military service of the United States.

Sec. 4. That title to pension under this act shall commence from the date of filing application therefor in the Bureau of Pensions after the passage and approval of this act.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. STAFFORD. I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. STAFFORD. From what I have heard of it I think I shall be, although I am not positive.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri is entitled to 20 minutes and the gentleman from Wisconsin to 20 minutes.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I desire to very briefly state the purpose of this bill. This is the second time that this bill has been reported to the House by the unanimous vote of the Invalid Pensions Committee. When it was reported to the House before, for some reason we were not able to get it up for consideration. By this bill we hope to do to-day what ought to have been done, in my opinion, many years ago; that is, to recognize and to pension the State troops who rendered the same services in defense of the Government during the Civil War that was rendered by the Regular troops, all of whom have long since been granted pensions. I can speak with more information about Missouri troops, because I have given them more attention, but there were State militia in Kentucky, Indiana, and other States that rendered the same character of service. The Missouri Militia was recognized by President Lincoln as a part of his army, and he asked the governor of that State not to disband the militia, because they were rendering a service which, if they were discontinued, would compel him to send his Regular troops to take their places. It is true that the State of Missouri paid its militia during the Civil War, but after the war was over Congress reimbursed the State for every dollar that it had paid out to sustain its militia. They fought side by side with the Regular troops. Some of them were wounded and many of them were killed in the battles that were fought in defense of the Union at that time. They fought with Government arms and ammunition, lived upon Government provisions, and were commanded by Federal officers.

Mr. LANGLEY. And if the gentleman will permit me to suggest, the troops of Kentucky and some of the other States did the same thing.

Mr. RUSSELL. Kentucky's militia was in exactly the same attitude. She had some State troops that rendered similar service, sometimes for six months and sometimes for a year, fighting side by side with the Regular troops in the battles of the Civil War, using the ammunition of the Government, and fighting under the command of Federal officers. After the war was over Congress returned to Kentucky, as it did to Missouri, every dollar paid out by that State to sustain the militia during the war.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; I yield.

Mr. WALSH. What are the other States that are interested? I notice from the report that Kentucky and Missouri are mentioned, and other States, and on page 2 mention is made of Indiana and Pennsylvania.

Mr. RUSSELL. There are four States that will have the principal part of men who will be benefited by this legislation—Missouri, Indiana, Kentucky, and Pennsylvania. There were some in Kansas, I think some in Arkansas, and perhaps some in Nebraska.

Mr. LANGLEY. And also in West Virginia.

Mr. RUSSELL. And some in West Virginia.

Mr. WALSH. How much will these various companies from these various States add to the pension rolls?

Mr. RUSSELL. It will be very slight, because there were very few in those States, even during the war, and nearly all of them have died. I think the estimate in the report of the probable expense of this bill is far beyond what will be true. It is stated that Missouri would probably add 5,000 soldiers to the rolls. I do not believe there are 2,000 of these militiamen alive to-day, and the few left are old and feeble. A great many of them afterwards went into the regular service, and that diminished the number; they are getting pensions now, and four-fifths of the balance of them have died. This was the best estimate that I have been able to get from the adjutant generals of the several States. I do not believe the bill, if passed, will cost the Government \$3,000,000 the first year, and the amount will rapidly decrease as the old soldiers pass away.

Mr. WALSH. Have some of these been pensioned under special acts of Congress?

Mr. RUSSELL. None of them, unless they were wounded in battle. We have tried in some cases to get through special bills, and while some of them have passed in the House they have usually, if not always, been defeated in the Senate.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; I will.

Mr. FESS. I am ignorant of the facts in the case, but how does it come that the other States are not in the same situation as the four mentioned?

Mr. RUSSELL. The chief part of the State troops were in the border States that did not secede, such as Kentucky and Missouri. There were a few State troops raised in some of the other States; but the great body of these troops were in Kentucky and Missouri, the two border States during the war, and they fought with the Union troops, and were paid by the States at the time; but Congress has paid back the money, recognizing that they rendered necessary and valuable services for the Union.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. Just for a moment.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. It may enlighten the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Fess] to state that the troops from Indiana that are included in this bill served principally in resisting the Morgan raid and they saved Cincinnati, the One hundred and eighth Indiana especially. I know that regiment was intrenched under command of Gen. Lew Wallace at the time that the Morgan raid was threatening the States.

Mr. LANGLEY. They rendered a valuable service.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have set out here in the report documents which I wish the Members would read, letters and orders written and signed by President Lincoln, saying that the Missouri Militia was a valuable part of his Army and that they were rendering an important and a beneficial service.

Mr. FESS. Could the gentleman tell me who were the Squirrel Hunters in connection with the Civil War?

Mr. RUSSELL. No; I do not know.

Mr. LANGLEY. Those are organizations, I think, drawn in the service.

Mr. RUSSELL. This bill does not include anybody except State troops who fought during the Civil War to put down the rebellion in cooperation with Federal troops and under the command of Federal officers. In Missouri our militia were commanded for a time by Gen. Schofield, a Federal officer.

Mr. FESS. If the gentleman will permit, the designation, I think, applies to the group that defended Cincinnati on the occasion of the Morgan riot, and I wondered whether that was a Federal or a State organization.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, how much time have I taken?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Were they not troops that enlisted for service for 100 days?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has used eight minutes.

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield time to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL]. How much time does he wish?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I want about three or four minutes after some one who is opposed to the bill has used some time. Let the gentleman reserve the remainder of his time.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the remainder of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin is entitled to 20 minutes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I think we are going rather fast at this time when we are so pressed for revenue to consider a bill that has been rejected in prior Congresses to pension not only the soldiers of those who were connected with the State militia, but also their widows and children. Obviously this very proposal has met with opposition in the Senate, otherwise the special bills included in the omnibus pension bills which have gone to the Senate to pension soldiers connected with State militia who had performed real service in real battle would have passed. This bill seeks to open up the floodgates of the Treasury to State militia organizations whether they saw service or not.

Mr. LANGLEY. I beg the gentleman's pardon.

Mr. STAFFORD. Where is that limitation?

Mr. LANGLEY. He must have rendered actual service for 90 days.

Mr. STAFFORD. Just like the home guards to-day are rendering actual service in the present emergency by police duty. This bill is not limited to those who smelled powder and really saw actual fighting. There may be instances where there were State militiamen who were identified with actual fighting,

but there is no such limitation in this bill. Furthermore, there is nothing in this bill that prevents claim agents from obtaining returns. Who knows—I do not know—but who knows there may not have been and have been for years a lobby seeking to have this bill passed, with large fees to come as a result of it—

Mr. RUSSELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. I yield, in fairness, of course, to the gentleman from Missouri after that statement.

Mr. RUSSELL. This is an amendment to the Sherwood bill, and it provides that attorneys can not get any fees, and this appropriates that as a part of the law.

Mr. STAFFORD. I will stand corrected as to that, and I am glad the gentleman corrected me.

Mr. IGOE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. I will.

Mr. IGOE. As I understand the bill, it is limited to those soldiers who served under Federal officers armed and equipped by the—

Mr. STAFFORD. I know Missouri is interested in this; and if we may establish this precedent, and especially now, when the Treasury is in such need of funds, why, we will have the precedent also for the home guards after this great war is over. They, too, will claim to have a pensionable status. I think of all times this bill should not be now considered. We have heard from time to time—at least, I have—of the pressure brought by Missouri Representatives for giving the Missouri militia a pensionable status. The Senate of the United States, from the admission of the gentleman from Missouri, has refused to recognize that they were entitled to any pensionable status.

Mr. LANGLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IGOE. The reason the Senate has refused is that it says that it ought to be done in a general bill; that is the reason.

Mr. LANGLEY. The Senate took the position there ought to be general legislation.

Mr. STAFFORD. I believe, so far as I am concerned, there ought to be special legislation which applies only to those who saw real service.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Does the gentleman know most of those men were in a large number of small, hot, bitter fights in Missouri, and were fighting all over the State?

Mr. STAFFORD. There might have been local engagements.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. They were local engagements, and they were for blood, too.

Mr. FARR. In Pennsylvania they were engaged in bitter fights.

Mr. KINKAID. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska to speak for the home guards of that State.

Mr. KINKAID. Does the gentleman know that the survivors of these militiamen who fought in the Civil War are not now confined to the States they were chosen from, but are scattered over the States of the Union?

Mr. STAFFORD. Why did not they join the Federal forces in the regular way? Why did they stay back at home and why did not they yield themselves to command of the military authorities to defend the Union just as to-day those connected with the National Army are yielding themselves for the national purpose? They were under the State militia to do home duty as home guards are now doing. I reserve the remainder of my time. Mr. Speaker, how much time have I used?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has used five minutes.

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] three minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas is recognized for three minutes.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, it is too late to talk about taking money out of the Treasury to pay for wars. This is to pay for a war that is past, a debt that has long been due to soldiers in the service of the United States in the sixties. Few rendered better service to the country than did the men who are included within the provisions of this bill. They were from Missouri, they were from Kansas, they were from Nebraska, they were from New York, Pennsylvania, and from many other States of the Union. They fought in some of the hardest-fought battles of the war, including Gettysburg. Why has not this thing been done before? Simply because the legislation was attempted by special bills. It was said, "Why do you not include them all in one bill?" No one can explain why this was not done. It is just a question of rendering justice to men who performed a great service to their country. Men from Kansas went to Missouri, fought down in Arkansas; they remained in the service until the war was over. They did not take the time to enlist in the regular service. They were not

thinking about the organization they were with. They were thinking about rendering service to the country at the time, and they were taking no chances on anything except rendering the quickest and best service they could to their country. It is the purpose of this bill to give them a pensionable status. They rendered exactly the same kind of service in the field as the men they fought side by side with. They fought under Union commanders and beside the men in the regular service who have been pensioned for years. I know some of them. I always thought they had been in the regular service. They belong to the Grand Army of the Republic. They have suffered every hardship that any other soldier suffered—

Mr. ALEXANDER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Yes.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I have in mind an old man, about 80 years of age now, who had 250 days of actual service during the Civil War in Missouri, and yet he has no pensionable status.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I have one in my home town who served in Missouri, and a better citizen never lived anywhere, and until he became old a few years ago he never suggested such a thing as a pension. I introduced a special bill for him, but it could not pass, because the committees of Congress said that they wanted to include him along with all the other men who served in similar organizations. And so it is. The only way to do justice to these men is to pass this bill, and I sincerely hope that further objection on the ground that it takes money out of the Treasury will not be made. These men have this due them, not as a gratuity, but as a matter of absolute justice. We agreed to provide for them just as we agreed to provide for the others who fought the battles of that great war. They were included among those whom Lincoln said at the close of the war should be provided for, as well as their dependents.

Mr. WALSH. When was that agreement made?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. When Lincoln said that those who fought the battles of the war, and their dependents, should be taken care of in their declining years.

Mr. WALSH. He did not refer to the militia.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. He referred to those who fought the battles of the war.

Mr. WALSH. He referred to those who were in the Federal service.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. He did not confine his statement to the regular troops and recognized all who fought in the battles of the war, without regard to where they came from or the organization in which they served. I hope this bill will pass. It does justice long delayed.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH].

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, it is not a popular thing to-day to refuse or decline approval of pension legislation which attempts to do justice to those who in the troublesome days of 1861 engaged in defending various sections of this country. But I submit that after the great Commonwealth of Missouri has received from the Federal Treasury at least the sum of \$7,456,000 in one payment and various other payments from time to time, for the use of its militia in doing guard duty or repelling invasion, or engaging in skirmishes within its borders or across the borders, for the protection of its own homes and firesides, that the State of Missouri is in a position to do something for these men. The report here does not set forth whether it has ever attempted to come to their relief or make provision for them or not.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Now, does the gentleman know that this sum of \$7,000,000 and these other odd sums were given to Missouri to recoup that State for money that it actually spent in fitting those troops, and arming them, and in giving them uniforms? It was not in the nature of a compensation. It was paying back the money that the State of Missouri patriotically put into the war because it could not get the Federal administration out there to put in enough.

Mr. WALSH. This sum was paid to reimburse the State on account of money expended, and then there were various other sums paid to the State of Missouri to reimburse it. But we have not heard of the other States where the State militia went into the Union service and faced the enemy being paid or reimbursed. The truth is that there are three or four States—Indiana, Pennsylvania, Kansas, Kentucky, and Missouri—that are known. Some other States are referred to, but no statistics are given, whose troops did valuable service. There is no question about their repelling invasion perhaps, and about their defending the States, and if facing the enemy in actual service they deserve consideration. But they were not part of the Regular Army, and I doubt whether the great Lincoln in his

reference, at the close of the war, to what would be done for the people at the close of the war, contemplated making provision for militiamen who saw no fighting.

Now, a great many of them, of course, it will be said, did not come within the 90-day provision. But many who will come within that limitation did no actual fighting. They simply comprised a home guard and were not fighting men in the true sense.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALSH. Certainly.

Mr. RUSSELL. Would the gentleman let me read just about two lines from this report, instead of answering the question?

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

Mr. RUSSELL. This is what President Lincoln said at the conclusion of his remarks when the Government was about to disband the militia. He said:

I, therefore, as at present advised, can not attempt the destruction of the enrolled militia in Missouri.

That was after stating their valuable service.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I would like to ask the gentleman from Massachusetts and the gentleman from Missouri if there is not a precedent for the payment of this money, at least a precedent embodying the principle contained in this bill? Some years ago I recall distinctly that Congress passed a bill reimbursing the State of Pennsylvania for money which it paid, or which it had reimbursed to the business men of Philadelphia, for money which they had paid to the militiamen of Pennsylvania who went down to help Meade in that battle.

Mr. RUSSELL. They returned the money, you know, to Kentucky and to Missouri; money advanced to sustain these militiamen. Congress reimbursed them for the money on the ground that they had rendered a Federal service.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield me three or four minutes more?

Mr. STAFFORD. I yield to the gentleman four minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for four minutes more.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, of course Pennsylvania has been reimbursed, and Missouri has been reimbursed. I imagine that Indiana has also been reimbursed from the Federal Treasury, and possibly Kentucky. But it seems to me that before we embark upon this general legislation to make these militiamen the beneficiaries at this particular time we ought to know how much it is going to cost, and to know in such case that actual fighting service was rendered. Now, here is a report, voluminous, with many extracts, and conveying the information that legislation similar to this now proposed, not quite so general in character, has been attempted before and failed.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALSH. The first time this was attempted—

Mr. RUSSELL. Does not the gentleman think that those people who rendered that faithful service to this Government 55 years ago have waited long enough?

Mr. WALSH. Of course, that question can be asked with reference to any legislation in the nature of pension legislation. In fact, I think I may have asked the question myself of the gentleman as a member of the Committee on Invalid Pensions, but it was in reference to volunteers who had served as a part of the Regular Establishment and who had not remained subject to the State call and only State jurisdiction and who were fighting. These volunteers, these militia, could have become a part of the Regular Establishment very easily. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] stated that they did not do it; they did not take the time to do it. Of course, they did not; they remained as a State militia, and they remained for the most part near their own firesides, and the character of the service which they rendered was local, and it was under State command, and some never saw the enemy.

Mr. FARR. The Pennsylvanians were not members of the State militia. They were called out on account of the invasion of Pennsylvania. A great many of them served at Gettysburg.

Mr. WALSH. What were they?

Mr. FARR. They were emergency men. They volunteered to protect the Union.

Mr. WALSH. Does the gentleman think that the Pennsylvanians come under the provisions of this bill?

Mr. FARR. That is my understanding.

Mr. WALSH. They were not State militiamen.

Mr. RUSSELL. Any State organization that served for 90 days in cooperation with the Federal troops and under the com-

mand of Federal officers in putting down the rebellion will come under this bill.

Mr. WALSH. That would be within the provision of the amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. Of the bill also.

Mr. WALSH. The amendment opens the door still wider. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FARR] states that his troops were not State militia.

Mr. FARR. They were emergency men.

Mr. WALSH. He states that they were emergency men. By whom were they raised?

Mr. RUSSELL. By the governor of the State.

Mr. FARR. The governor of the State called for volunteers, because Pennsylvania was being invaded.

Mr. FOCHT. I would like to ask the gentleman how he interprets the word "militia," for the simple reason that it has been suggested by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FARR] that Pennsylvania, during the invasion of that State, raised a large number of emergency men.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FOCHT. I should like to have unanimous consent to speak for five minutes on this important question. We will get right down to where Pennsylvania stands, or ought to stand.

Mr. RUSSELL. This includes any State organization. If I had the time I would be glad to yield it to the gentleman.

Mr. FOCHT. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time for this debate is limited.

Mr. FOCHT. I ask unanimous consent to address the committee for five minutes.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the time of this debate be extended 10 minutes, and that 5 minutes of that time be given to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOCHT] and 5 minutes to me.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent that the time of this debate be extended 10 minutes, 5 minutes to go to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOCHT] and 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK]. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Reserving the right to object, I have demands for time in opposition that I can not meet. I ask unanimous consent to make it 15 minutes, giving those in favor of the proposition 10 minutes and those opposed to it 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to extending the time 15 minutes, 5 minutes to go to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOCHT], and 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD]?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, I want to suggest to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that with the rapidity with which we are passing pension bills now I think the militia will be taken care of at this session, and the emergency men will probably be taken care of just before the next election.

Mr. FARR. They are included in this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOCHT] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. FOCHT. I yield first to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK].

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, this bill ought to have been passed 50 years ago. [Applause.] If it had not been for the 111,000 men that Missouri sent to the Union Army, when that State had only 160,000 voters in 1860, and if it had not been for the 75,000 Kentuckians that Kentucky sent to the Union Army, the Confederate flag would be waving in Richmond this minute. Now, it is true that a good many of these men never went out of the State of Missouri, but they took the place of the men who did go. Missourians and Kentuckians did not need any great amount of drilling to know how to use a rifle or a double-barreled shotgun. They went from their homes and fought innumerable battles in Missouri, in squads, companies, regiments, brigades, and armies. Of course, Pennsylvania sent her emergency men to Gettysburg when Pennsylvania was invaded. Missouri was invaded every two or three months during those four years, and so was Kentucky, and some of those men fought the most bloody battles that were fought during the entire Civil War. They were shot to pieces; cut to pieces; they died. The State was overrun by both armies.

There is no prejudice left in the State of Missouri growing out of the Civil War; and I will tell you what happens: When a Union soldier writes to me to get him a pension or to get his pension increased, his Confederate neighbor writes a letter

right along in the same mail asking that it be done. [Applause.]

Talk about these men not fighting! I will tell you what I saw with my own eyes when I was a small boy. I saw seven Kentucky home guards charge the whole of Morgan's cavalry—the flower of Kentucky chivalry—down a broad gravel road without any ambush about it. The Kentuckians and the Missourians would fight the devil. [Laughter and applause.]

There has always been a discrimination against the border State men. It was easy to be a Union man in Massachusetts, it was easy to be a Confederate in Mississippi, but in Kentucky and Missouri, in that border land, it was perilous to be either or to sit on the fence; a fellow had to feel of his topknot every morning to see if, like the flag of his country, it was still there. [Laughter.] It was father against son, brother against brother, neighbor against neighbor, and frequently husband against wife. If there ever was a set of men worthy and fit to be put on the pension roll, it is the Kentuckians and the Missourians. They followed Frank Blair, who did more than any other one man in the United States, except Abraham Lincoln, to save the Union. If monuments were built in this town to soldiers in proportion to the services they rendered, Blair's would tower among the tallest. He kept Missouri from seceding. That prevented Kentucky from seceding; and if you had given the 111,000 Union soldiers of Missouri and 75,000 from Kentucky, and those two great agricultural States to feed on, they never could have starved Lee's army into surrender. This bill ought to have been passed long ago. It has been frequently reported. Judge Henry W. Gibson, of Tennessee, offered in a bill like this to put them all on the pension roll, but they did not serve long enough. You had to have a length of service of 90 days. It was fixed accidentally. There was an entire battalion in my district that served 89 days, which shut them out of the general pension law. There is no man on the top of the earth with good sense enough—Solomon would not have had sense enough with his wonderful headpiece—to tell why a man who served 89 days ought not to be put on a pensionable basis as well as a man who had served 90 days. If the House wants to do justice long deferred, it ought to pass this bill with a whoop. [Applause.]

Mr. FOCHT. Mr. Speaker, I fully realize the embarrassment of following the eloquent and distinguished Speaker, a statesman and logician. He has spoken well and with conviction with respect to the border States, and while Pennsylvania occupied a position of somewhat different relation from that of the border States, nevertheless the question of the invasion of Pennsylvania in 1863 by Gen. Lee and his army is interesting historically and of vast importance. The fact of the matter is that during the whole period from the outbreak of the war until after the battle of Gettysburg, nearly all of the conflicts and raids were within 50 or 75 miles of Washington. The reason for that was that the Union troops were massed about the Capital to protect it, always being in fear and apprehension that the Confederates would attack in force the Federal Capital.

Now, in relation to what was suggested by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER] as establishing a precedent for a bill like this: The business men of Philadelphia furnished the clothing for the emergency men of Pennsylvania who were called in 1863 by Abraham Lincoln through Gov. Curtin. The State of Pennsylvania later reimbursed the business men, paying them interest on their loan, and later the United States Government reimbursed Pennsylvania without interest on the loan. That is the way that came about and was concluded.

Now, as to the justice of this bill, the facts apply to Pennsylvania as elsewhere. But to these emergency men it does not apply, as I understand, since it relates to only militiamen who must have been in the service 90 days. A gentleman on this side in all generosity and spirit of chivalry and justice told me that he understood what I meant when I referred to the emergency men, and that just as certain as the men of Missouri and Kentucky or any other border State who served a week or a month or three months or longer are favorably regarded, so will all be considered as having been Federal soldiers and will come within the interpretation of the pension laws. Certainly, if Missouri and Kentucky militiamen are entitled to the consideration that will be given them in this bill, it should extend to the emergency men of Pennsylvania, who answered when Lee marched triumphantly up the great Cumberland Valley, creating alarm among the people lest the invasion of the State be extended to Harrisburg and Philadelphia. Thousands of emergency men answered the call and resisted the advance. My own father, a minister of the gospel, left the pulpit and went out with them, and by reason of exposure lost his life when I was a year old. I know that there were emergency men there who are entitled to consideration

because they protected the State and to a great extent interfered with if they did not intercept a portion of Lee's army beyond the Susquehanna. Senator Daniels, a brave, chivalrous gentleman from Virginia, told me all about how he reached the Susquehanna River and there saw the bridge in flames, the torch having been applied by one of these emergency men to prevent him from crossing the river and invading Lancaster County. None of those men were out 90 days, but they did perform a great service. The force of these emergency men broke the advance of Lee and his army, and instead of having the great battle at a place somewhere farther east, at a point which might have been selected by Lee, Meade and his generals selected the place to deliver the blow at Gettysburg, and they chose Round Top, Culps Hill, and the heights south of Gettysburg, and there rolled back the tide that broke against them. Some of us may think that it is pretty long after the war to do this, but the very fact that it is so long after the war, and the very fact that there are only a few yet living who participated even in the border States of Missouri and Kentucky, make these men no less entitled to the passage of this bill, and I am anxious that we also pass a bill when it comes along for the emergency men of Pennsylvania who went down and resisted the great advance of Lee and his armies.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOCHT. Yes.

Mr. FARR. The emergency men of Pennsylvania are included in this bill.

Mr. FOCHT. Yes; but they must have served three months, and they did not serve that long. Let us amend the bill and include them all along the line.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOCHT. Yes.

Mr. FESS. When Morgan made his famous charge there was a group of men called out at Cincinnati to protect that city, and they served for a certain time. They were nicknamed the squirrel hunters. Those men are not included.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. FOCHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one minute longer in order to answer the question.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FESS. Those men are not included in this measure, because this limits it to those who served 90 days.

Mr. FOCHT. It ought to be amended to include them all and make it a clean-up along the border and elsewhere of all that collection of loyal men who did serve their country but who have heretofore been barred from participating in pensions and honors due them. The bill should be so amended as to include them all, thus finally recognizing patriotism in whatever measure exhibited.

Mr. FESS. I think so, because these men came out at the call and offered their lives in a very emergent case in the Civil War.

Mr. FOCHT. There can be only a very few of them. I would say scarcely 200 in Pennsylvania, many less than 500, and I doubt whether there are anything like 5,000 in the entire country. But Lincoln called, and they responded, so let us give them this honored place in the sun along with the veterans who gave longer and greater service and whose valor is always cherished and ever near our hearts.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TILLMAN].

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. Speaker, the exact status of these soldiers ought to be understood, and when it is I think there will be no question about the House voting for this bill. They have been denied pensions on a mere technicality. President Lincoln recognized them as a part of his Army. They have failed to be accorded a pensionable status by the ruling of former Secretary of War Root, whose ability as a lawyer is beyond question. Here are his declarations with reference to the question of whether they are entitled to pensions. He said:

The Missouri Militia did not constitute a part of the Army of the United States, but were a force acting from time to time in cooperation with it; that the order disbanding such troops can not be construed as equivalent to an honorable discharge in the sense in which these words are used in section 2304, Revised Statutes.

They were recognized by competent authority as a part of the United States Army. They fought and received wounds, they served in cooperation with the Army, and were denied pensions simply because their discharge was not quite technical. As the Speaker of the House well said, they participated in a number of battles. The most prominent battle in Missouri in which they participated was the battle of Springfield, and their defense under Holland at that time against the largely outnumbering force of the Confederates under Marmaduke constitutes a very bright page in the history of the State troops.

My State is only slightly interested in this measure. There are a few members of the Enrolled Missouri Militia in my district. They fought in the battles mentioned in this report, and fought gallantly. Now, if the policy of the country is to pension men who fought in the Union Armies and cooperated with them, this bill ought to pass. [Applause.] I call to mind a few members of the Enrolled Missouri Militia now honored citizens of my district, which borders on the State of Missouri, Mr. R. H. Hamilton, of Keener, Boone County, and Mr. Willis Russell, of Green Forest, both high-type men, men of high character, and men who deserve a reasonable pension to make easier their lot now that they are entering upon the final march that is soon to end at the portals of the great hereafter. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I believe I have 11 minutes remaining.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has 11 minutes remaining.

Mr. STAFFORD. I yield one minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH].

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUSSELL] a question.

Mr. RUSSELL. I will be very glad to answer the gentleman.

Mr. WALSH. Is it a fact men who belonged to these organizations of the State militia of Missouri, Kentucky, Indiana, and Pennsylvania, if wounded in battle, can secure a pension?

Mr. RUSSELL. Some of them, yes. They had a rule in the committee, or there was an act that permitted soldiers in the State organizations who were actually wounded in battle to be granted pensions.

Mr. WALSH. Is that by general law?

Mr. RUSSELL. I will be very glad to permit me to correct him there, there was a statute, which expired by limitation in 1873. They had to apply before that date.

Mr. RUSSELL. I believe that is a fact. That law is now out of existence.

Mr. WALSH. Up until 1873 those men who were wounded could procure pensions under the general law?

Mr. RUSSELL. I know there was such an act at one time.

Mr. WALSH. Have they been securing pensions since that time, where they were wounded, by special act?

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not think since I have been in Congress, nearly 10 years, that any man has ever gotten a pension as a Missouri enrolled militiaman. The House has passed some such bills, but the Senate has, I think, in all cases refused to do so. Has the gentleman a minute remaining? If so, I would like to read two or three lines from a letter written by one of the Speaker's constituents, a man whom he knows very well, Jesse F. Trower. Somebody said something about these soldiers rendering no service. He says:

I gave 511 days of actual military services in this State. That was more arduous and dangerous than many of these drawing pensions for years. In the battle at Ashley, Pettis County, Mo., one of my brothers was killed, another brother was badly wounded. I was by the side of the one killed.

That is the kind of service that he rendered in Missouri, and thousands of other militiamen rendered the same faithful service. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WOOD].

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, many will remember that the southern part of the State of Indiana was in open revolt for quite a period during the Civil War; that had it not been for the State militia organization under the command of Federal officers there is no telling what would have happened along the border between Indiana and Kentucky. Oliver P. Morton, governor not only of the State of Indiana but acting as the Union governor of the State of Kentucky, was commended time and time again by President Lincoln for his ceaseless vigilance in keeping in repression the southern sympathizers along the Ohio River. The One hundred and eighth Indiana did signal service, not only in keeping down rebellion within the borders of the State of Indiana but likewise in resisting attacks and repeated raids by Morgan in the State of Indiana and in the State of Ohio. Yet this regiment was never mustered into the United States service. At the suggestion of Abraham Lincoln, Gen. Lew Wallace, one of the greatest volunteer generals to give his service in the Civil War, went to the city of Cincinnati and took the One hundred and eighth Indiana with him; also two or three other companies and parts of Indiana regiments. He also organized an army out of the citizenship of the city of Cincinnati, threw up breastworks, and saved the city of Cincinnati from being destroyed by Gen. Morgan.

This is but a sample of the service that was rendered by these men in the State of Indiana along the border, and not only in Indiana but across in Kentucky, where they fought side by side with the Kentuckians, and also across the border in the State of Illinois. The southern part of Illinois was in open

rebellion against the North, or a considerable portion of it was for a time, and these men rendered signal service there along with the militia of that State. I indorse the statement of the Speaker of the House that it is a duty the Government owes these men. It is not a charity that we are giving them, but it is paying them for services rendered and recognizing them as we have recognized those who served as members of the United States Army. We are giving them a chance to have their names placed upon the scroll of honor—the United States pension roll—to which they are justly entitled for patriotic service rendered.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON].

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, while I am in sympathy with the legislation, I have asked for this time in order to call a matter to the attention of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUSSELL].

In response to the suggestion of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] as to attorney fees, it was the opinion of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUSSELL] that, due to the fact that the act of 1912 had a prohibition of attorney fees none was necessary in this act. I would like to call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that while section 1 does extend the provisions of the act of 1912 to this class of men, this is not strictly an amendment of that act and there might be a question as to whether attorneys could secure fees under section 1. But section 2, as to widows, minor children, and dependent parents, certainly would open the way for pension attorneys to get fees. While I am in sympathy with the legislation I am not in sympathy with a lot of fees being opened up here to Washington pension agents. I want to ask the gentleman whether, in order to remove all possible question, he would be willing to accept an amendment such as was placed in similar legislation to the effect that no attorney shall be recognized and no attorney fee shall be paid for the presentation or prosecution of any claim under the provisions of this act?

Mr. RUSSELL. I will say to the gentleman from Michigan that I would have no objection in the world, but he understands it would have to be done by unanimous consent. But I take it, this being an extension of the Sherwood Act, which has that provision—

Mr. CRAMTON. Section 2 refers to persons who do not come under the Sherwood Act.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Sherwood Act does not include widows—

Mr. CRAMTON. Or children.

Mr. RUSSELL. Well, I have no objection—

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, if this is the proper place, I ask unanimous consent for the consideration of the amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent to offer an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

Mr. CRAMTON. It will stand as a new section, to be numbered as section 5.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CRAMTON: At the end of the bill, on page 3, insert the following as a new section:

"Sec. 5. That no attorney shall be recognized and no attorney fees shall be paid for the presentation or prosecution of any claim under the provisions of this act."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The section is inserted at the end of the bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the gentleman use the balance of his time. I have but one more speech.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I shall not indulge in prophecy as to what the status of the Union would have been if there had been no State militia to protect the border States from invasion of the Southern forces. It is certain, however, that this bill in its amended form seeks to give pensionable status to men in the militia forces and other forces that never were in battle, and its purpose is to include all and give them a pensionable status, and by so doing cast reflection upon the hundreds of thousands of Union soldiers who volunteered in defense of their country. They were slackers to stay at their firesides and repel some temporary invasion. They were merely members of the State militia acting, in a way, as policemen, to give protection to their localities but not obligated for service outside at the command of the military officers of the Nation.

Mr. DEWALT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman permit an interruption?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

Mr. DEWALT. Do you call the Battle of Gettysburg a temporary invasion?

Mr. STAFFORD. Oh, I well recall what was done at the Battle of Gettysburg, because my mother has told me how Philadelphia was alarmed and how all were called upon to go to the rescue, if need be, to prevent an invasion; but that was a temporary affair. These men did not volunteer as my mother's brothers volunteered in the service from the beginning of the war to the end of the war. They were merely called upon to protect their homes, fearful that Lee's army coming up from the South would go on to Philadelphia and New York. If they are on a par with the men who volunteered for three years, if they had the mettle in them to offer their service and their lives for the entire war, why did they not volunteer?

You are seeking now by this legislation to minimize the effect of the service and the valor of the true guardians of the Union, those who volunteered for the duration of the war, ready to go wherever their commanding officers would direct them. You are asking here by this amendment which is offered to include all who were members of State militia, who chanced to be members of the State militia and other organizations and had served 90 days, whether they had smelled powder or not. A few instances are cited—and we know how often a few instances are cited to justify a general bill which, if considered in its entirety, could not be justified—a few instances are cited where some men had engaged in battle; but this discussion shows that these men in the State militia did not leave the State.

I read to you what the official records show, as stated by Secretary of War Root, when he passed upon this question:

It will be seen from the foregoing that the enrolled Missouri Militia was a State force, organized under the militia law of the State for State service; that portions of it served—

Yes; that is the argument made here to justify this general bill extending to all a pensionable status—

that portions of it served at various times and at short periods under United States officers and informally with United States troops in defense of the State.

We have declined up to the present moment to pension the old soldiers who enlisted for the duration of the war and longer if they had not served 90 days. If they had served only 85 days, you can not get a special bill through here, even though they had enlisted for two years or during the duration of the war. But now you are going to pension those who were members of the State militia, who joined that honorable body to protect their own firesides, who acted as police officers in a little larger sense, but who were unwilling to go to the front in company with the regular forces.

Mr. FOCHT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. That is what you are doing, and you are minimizing by this action the character of service of those who volunteered for the duration of the war. You are placing on a parity with those men who enlisted in the regular organizations those who declined to enlist and respond to the call to service. You are placing those men on a parity with the valiant soldiers who enlisted in the Federal forces under the direction of the commanding officers of the national army. I again repeat that the organizations covered by this bill are nothing more than on a par with the home guards who are now being organized throughout the country to do police duty. Occasion might have arisen when these home guards might have been called upon to put down sedition, but as I see the country manifesting its national spirit in waging this war they will not be called upon for that service. Are you going to ask that they, too, when this war is over, shall be put on the same status as those valiant boys who are going abroad to fight our battles? That is what you are doing. You are putting on the same plane, on a par, the State militiamen with those who volunteered to go to the front and fight for the Union.

Mr. FOCHT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

Mr. FOCHT. Differentiating between the man who stayed at home and the man who went to the front, did not the feeling on the whole pension question reflect itself in the act of 1912—a service pension—and did not the gentleman vote for that?

Mr. STAFFORD. Unfortunately I was out of Congress at that time and did not have the privilege of voting on that question.

We have not up to the present time recognized the pensionable status of a soldier who had not served 90 days. You could not get a bill through Congress for such a man, even if he had rendered service for 85 days. Now you propose to pass a general law for those who stayed at home and were not involved in any battle whatever.

Mr. FOCHT. If we did those men an injustice before, we want now to correct that injustice. [Applause.]

Mr. STAFFORD. You want to do an injustice to the soldiers of the Civil War and pension these men who declined to enlist in the Federal service. You say that these men should have the same pensionable status as those who enlisted in the Federal service.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

Mr. RUSSELL. Does not my friend overlook this part of the bill showing what sort of service they rendered under orders of an officer of the United States, or who volunteered for the time being to serve with a regularly organized military or naval force?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes; under orders; but some of those men never saw service. They were merely doing police duty to protect their own homes, and you are citing a few instances of musket battles in Missouri, or down in Kentucky, when three-fourths of them never saw a battle at all, but remained at their firesides as members of the State militia.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time, three minutes, to my colleague from Missouri [Mr. HAMLIN].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized for three minutes.

Mr. HAMLIN. Mr. Speaker, I have sat here for several years and watched the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] perform, and he is always interesting and usually fair, but this is the first time I have ever seen him assume the rôle of the defender of the old soldier on the doubtful grounds that to pass this bill would be a reproach to the old Union soldier. The men who are taken care of in this bill fought for the Union side by side with those who now draw a pension, and many of whom have drawn pensions for years. I submit to do justice to anyone has never been and can not be a reflection on anyone else. All that we are asking in this bill is to do justice to a class of men who were not only loyal to the Union but who proved their loyalty by their action during the trying days of the Civil War.

Mr. Speaker, I think that there is a lamentable lack of right information in regard to the men affected by this measure. The men whom the gentleman from Wisconsin designates as "having done police duty" out in the State of Missouri thought they were rendering service to the Federal Government in the same way and under the same authority as those who happened to have been recognized afterwards as Federal troops. I know that the Seventy-second Enrolled Missouri Militia, to which reference has been made by my friend from Arkansas, Judge TILLMAN, did render effective service at the battle of Springfield in 1864. I also know that these men were under the control and subject to the orders of a Federal officer. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] refers to them as home guards. In our State the home-guard organizations have had a pensionable status for years. Shortly after the war closed a commission, known as the Taylor-Hawkins Commission, were sent out into our State. They reported on these different military organizations, and in that report they recognized the Missouri Home Guards, the Provisional Enrolled Militia, Missouri Cavalry, and certain other State militia organizations, but there were a number of certain other State militia organizations which they reported were not to be regarded as Federal troops. I have never been able to find out any reason why that distinction was made. I have inquired at the War Department, I have their report, I have investigated records, and I have never been able to find out the standard that commission used in reaching their conclusion. Now, gentlemen, here are the facts: These so-called militia organizations of the State were under the jurisdiction of the Federal Government. They were under the jurisdiction of a Federal officer. The Federal Government has recognized them by reimbursing the State for the money expended by it in their support. Gen. Schofield, a Federal general, had control of these organizations in our State during the war. They fought side by side with the men in the Missouri Cavalry, who have been recognized as a Federal organization. They fought side by side with the home-guard organizations, which have also been recognized as Federal troops. In my own county, in which the Battle of Springfield was fought, the Seventy-second Enrolled Missouri Militia went to the front and successfully defended the city of Springfield, drove Marmaduke and his forces away, fought side by side with Federal troops, were under the command of a Federal officer, underwent all the hardships and took all the dangers of regular Federal troops and other home organizations that have been recognized as Federal troops. But for some reason, as I stated, which I can not explain, under the Taylor-Hawkins Commission report, they have never been recognized as Government troops. It is but common justice and common honesty that these men be given a pensionable status, and thereby put

them on an equality with the men who are now drawing pensions; that is all that we ask.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired. All time has expired. The question is on suspending the rules and passing this bill with the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. STAFFORD) there were—ayes 53, noes 10.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, on that I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin makes the point of order that there is no quorum present, and evidently there is not. The Doorkeeper will lock the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify the absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll. Those in favor of suspending the rules and passing this bill with the amendment will, as their names are called, answer "yea"; those opposed will answer "nay."

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 176, nays 62, answered "present" 1, not voting 191, as follows:

YEAS—176.

Alexander	Ellsworth	Knutson	Rosenberg
Ashbrook	Esch	Kraus	Romjue
Ayres	Evans	La Follette	Rose
Barkley	Fairfield	Langley	Rubey
Barnhart	Farr	Lazaro	Rucker
Beakes	Ferris	Lea, Cal.	Russell
Beshlin	Fess	Lehlbach	Sanders, Ind.
Bland	Fields	Little	Sanders, N. Y.
Bowers	Flood	Littlepage	Schall
Britten	Focht	Lobeck	Scott, Iowa
Browne	Fordney	London	Scott, Mich.
Browning	Forster	Loneragan	Shackelford
Burroughs	Frear	Lufkin	Shallenberger
Butler	French	Lundeen	Sinnott
Campbell, Kans.	Fuller, Ill.	McAndrews	Slayden
Campbell, Pa.	Gandy	McArthur	Smith, Idaho
Cannon	Glynn	McClintic	Smith, Mich.
Carter, Okla.	Gould	McClulloch	Steele
Chandler, Okla.	Graham, Ill.	McKeown	Steenerson
Church	Gray, N. J.	McLemore	Sterling, Ill.
Claypool	Greene, Vi.	Magee	Strong
Clary	Hadley	Mapes	Switzer
Connelly, Kans.	Hamilton, Mich.	Martin	Tague
Cox	Hamlin	Mays	Taylor, Colo.
Crago	Harrison, Va.	Miller, Minn.	Temple
Cramton	Hawley	Miller, Wash.	Thomas
Crosser	Hayden	Mondell	Thompson
Dallinger	Hayes	Moon	Tillman
Davis	Helvering	Morgan	Timberlake
Decker	Hensley	Mott	Van Dyke
Delaney	Hersey	Mudd	Vestal
Dempsey	Hull, Iowa	Oldfield	Voigt
Denton	Humphreys	Olney	Volstead
Dewalt	Igoe	Osborne	Waldow
Dickinson	Johnson, Ky.	Parker, N. J.	Walton
Dill	Juhl	Platt	Wason
Dillon	Kearns	Polk	Wheeler
Dixon	Keating	Purnell	Wilson, Ill.
Doolittle	Kelly, Pa.	Raker	Wingo
Dowell	Kettner	Randall	Winslow
Dyer	Key, Ohio	Rankin	Wood, Ind.
Eagan	Kiess, Pa.	Reavis	Woodward
Elliott	King	Robbins	Young, N. Dak.
	Kinkaid	Roberts	Zihlman

NAYS—62.

Almon	Edmonds	Kincheloe	Stephens, Miss.
Anderson	Garner	Kitchin	Stevenson
Aswell	Garrett, Tenn.	Larsen	Summers
Bankhead	Garrett, Tex.	Lee, Ga.	Taylor, Ark.
Bell	Goodwin, Ark.	Mansfield	Venable
Black	Gray, A. A.	Montague	Vinson
Blackmon	Hardy	Nicholls, S. C.	Walsh
Blanton	Harrison, Miss.	Park	Watkins
Buchanan	Heflin	Price	Whaley
Byrnes, S. C.	Helm	Ragsdale	White, Ohio
Byrns, Tenn.	Holland	Rafney, H. T.	Wilson, La.
Candler, Miss.	Huddleston	Rayburn	Wilson, Tex.
Caraway	Hull, Tenn.	Robinson	Wright
Connally, Tex.	Jacoway	Rogers	Young, Tex.
Dominick	James	Sanford	
Eagle	Jones	Stafford	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1.

Cooper, Wis.

NOT VOTING—191.

Anthony	Collier	Dupré	Gordon
Austin	Cooper, Ohio	Elston	Graham, Pa.
Bacharach	Cooper, W. Va.	Emerson	Green, Iowa
Baer	Copley	Estopinal	Greene, Mass.
Boehrer	Costello	Fairchild, B. L.	Gregg
Borland	Crisp	Fairchild, G. W.	Griest
Brand	Currie, Mich.	Fisher	Griffin
Brodbeck	Curry, Cal.	Flynn	Hamill
Brumbaugh	Dale, N. Y.	Foss	Hamilton, N. Y.
Burnett	Dale, Vi.	Francis	Haskell
Cadwell	Darrow	Freeman	Hastings
Cantrill	Davidson	Fuller, Mass.	Haugen
Carew	Dent	Gallagher	Heaton
Carlin	Dies	Gallivan	Heintz
Carter, Mass.	Donovan	Gard	Hicks
Cary	Dooling	Garland	Hillard
Chandler, N. Y.	Doremus	Gillett	Hollingsworth
Clark, Fla.	Doughton	Glass	Hood
Clark, Pa.	Drane	Godwin, N. C.	Houston
Classon	Drukker	Good	Howard
Coady	Dunn	Goodall	Husted

Hutchinson	Merritt	Reed	Stedman
Ireland	Moore, Pa.	Riordan	Stephens, Nebr.
Johnson, S. Dak.	Moore, Ind.	Rouse	Sterling, Pa.
Johnson, Wash.	Morin	Rowe	Stiness
Kahn	Neely	Rowland	Sullivan
Kehoe	Nelson	Sabbath	Sweet
Kelley, Mich.	Nichols, Mich.	Sanders, La.	Swift
Kennedy, Iowa	Nolan	Saunders, Va.	Talbott
Kennedy, R. I.	Norton	Scott, Pa.	Templeton
Kreider	Oliver, Ala.	Scully	Tilson
LaGuardia	Oliver, N. Y.	Sears	Tinkham
Lasher	O'Shaunessy	Sells	Towner
Lever	Overmyer	Sherley	Treadway
Linthicum	Overstreet	Sherwood	Vare
Longworth	Padgett	Shouse	Walker
Lunn	Paige	Siegel	Ward
McCormick	Parker, N. Y.	Sims	Watson, Pa.
McFadden	Peters	Sisson	Watson, Va.
McKenzie	Phelan	Slemp	Weaver
McKinley	Porter	Sloan	Webb
McLaughlin, Mich.	Pou	Small	Welling
McLaughlin, Pa.	Powers	Smith, C. B.	Welty
Madden	Pratt	Smith, T. F.	White, Me.
Maher	Quin	Snell	Williams
Mann	Ralney, J. W.	Snook	Wise
Mason	Ramsey	Snyder	Woods, Iowa
Meeker	Ramseyer	Steagall	

So, two-thirds having voted in favor thereof, the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The following additional pairs were announced:

Until further notice:

Mr. BORLAND with Mr. CHANDLER of New York.
 Mr. BRAND with Mr. COOPER of Ohio.
 Mr. BURNETT with Mr. ELSTON.
 Mr. CANTRILL with Mr. FREEMAN.
 Mr. CARLIN with Mr. FULLER of Massachusetts.
 Mr. COADY with Mr. GOOD.
 Mr. COLLIER with Mr. GOODALL.
 Mr. DENT with Mr. GREEN of Iowa.
 Mr. DUPRE with Mr. HASKELL.
 Mr. GALLIVAN with Mr. HAUGEN.
 Mr. GODWIN of North Carolina with Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH.
 Mr. HASTINGS with Mr. JOHNSON of Washington.
 Mr. LINTHICUM with Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa.
 Mr. LUNN with Mr. LONGWORTH.
 Mr. OLIVER of Alabama with Mr. MCKENZIE.
 Mr. PARK with Mr. MADDEN.
 Mr. POU with Mr. MEEKER.
 Mr. ROUSE with Mr. MERRITT.
 Mr. NEELY with Mr. MOORES of Indiana.
 Mr. OLIVER of New York with Mr. MORIN.
 Mr. SANDERS of Louisiana with Mr. NELSON.
 Mr. O'SHAUNESSY with Mr. NOLAN.
 Mr. SIMS with Mr. RAMSEY.
 Mr. CHARLES B. SMITH with Mr. RAMSEYER.
 Mr. SNOOK with Mr. PARKER of New York.
 Mr. STEAGALL with Mr. STINESS.
 Mr. STEDMAN with Mr. SWEET.
 Mr. STERLING of Pennsylvania with Mr. TOWNER.
 Mr. WATSON of Virginia with Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania.
 Mr. WELLING with Mr. SLEMP.
 Mr. SEARS with Mr. WILLIAMS.
 Mr. SCULLY with Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin.
 Mr. ——— with Mr. AUSTIN.
 Mr. TALBOTT with Mr. NICHOLS of Michigan.
 Mr. DIES with Mr. HUSTED.
 Mr. CLARK of Florida with Mr. DAVIDSON.
 Mr. DRANE with Mr. NORTON.
 Mr. HAMILL with Mr. MCFADDEN.
 Mr. HOUSTON with Mr. KELLEY of Michigan.
 Mr. OVERSTREET with Mr. ROWE.
 Mr. SHERLEY with Mr. KAHN.
 Mr. WEBB with Mr. SELLS.
 Mr. WALKER with Mr. DARROW.

The result of the vote was then announced as above recorded.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill H. R. 12100 and the bill H. R. 12099 be given a privileged status, not to interfere with the consideration of conference reports or appropriation bills.

One of the bills amends the shipping act, the purpose being to make it clear that vessel property may not pass under foreign ownership without the consent of the Shipping Board, and also broadens the definition of "vessel" so as to include a vessel in the course of construction and before it is launched. The other bill is a bill to confer on the President power to prescribe charter rates and freight rates and to requisition vessels, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent to give a privileged status to the two bills named,

not to interfere with conference reports and appropriation bills. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I ask the gentleman to withdraw his request until morning, so as to give opportunity to Members of the House to examine these bills.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I have no objection to that. They are important bills, and one is strictly a war measure.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Speaker, on Decoration Day I heard a very useful and patriotic address delivered by the Hon. FREDERICK ZIEHLMAN, a Member of this House, on the Antietam battle field. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting it therein.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD in the manner indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

VALIDATING CERTAIN PUBLIC-LAND ENTRIES.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill H. R. 78, to validate certain public-land entries.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, June 4, 1918, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, submitting a supplemental estimate for the services of a clerk stenographer and typist, Treasury Department (H. Doc. No. 1143); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Secretary of War submitting a proposed clause of legislation authorizing and directing allowance and credit in accounts of Lieut. Col. Charles J. Nelson, Quartermaster Corps, United States Army (H. Doc. No. 1144); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

3. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting an estimate of appropriation required by the Treasury Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919 (H. Doc. No. 1145); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. CHARLES B. SMITH, from the Committee on Patents, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 8763) to amend the act entitled "An act to extend temporarily the time for filing applications and fees and taking action in the United States Patent Office in favor of nations granting reciprocal rights to United States citizens," approved August 17, 1916, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 616), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. KEATING: A bill (H. R. 12352) for the retirement of employees in the classified civil service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROGERS: A bill (H. R. 12353) to authorize the Secretary of War to provide and issue distinctive buttons or badges to men who, since April 6, 1917, have been honorably discharged from the armed forces of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DENT: A bill (H. R. 12354) to authorize the Secretary of War to exchange certain lands owned by the United States in Monroe County, Pa., for certain other adjacent lands owned by the Monroe Water Supply Co.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SANDERS of Louisiana: A bill (H. R. 12355) to regulate the interstate use of automobiles and all self-propelled vehicles which use the public highways in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CRAMTON: A bill (H. R. 12356) to amend section 801 of public act No. 50 of the Sixty-fifth Congress, entitled "An act to provide revenue to defray war expenses, and for other purposes," approved October 3, 1917; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LEHLBACH: A bill (H. R. 12357) to increase rates of pensions for permanent specific disabilities incurred while in the military or naval service of the United States; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SIMS: A bill (H. R. 12358) to extend the franking privilege to such officials of the several States as are charged with the administration of the State Confederate pension laws; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. POU: Resolution (H. Res. 370) urging the immediate consideration of Senate bill 1553; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ASWELL: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 299) authorizing the Postmaster General to expend not more than 50 per cent of the gross earnings of motor-truck parcel-post routes for the construction and maintenance of the highways on which the service is or may be established; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AYRES: A bill (H. R. 12359) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Anderson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BOWERS: A bill (H. R. 12360) granting a pension to William P. Robinson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DARROW: A bill (H. R. 12361) granting an increase of pension to Henry C. Shane; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GARD: A bill (H. R. 12362) granting a pension to Frank Shaw; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12363) granting a pension to George Matson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LEE of Georgia: A bill (H. R. 12364) granting a pension to James W. Ledford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. POLK: A bill (H. R. 12365) granting an increase of pension to Job W. Conoway; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SANDERS of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 12366) for the relief of John H. Kidd; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12367) granting a pension to Patrick Lehan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12368) granting an increase of pension to James F. Dickey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SNOOK: A bill (H. R. 12369) granting an increase of pension to Philip H. Anschutz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAGUE: A bill (H. R. 12370) granting an increase of pension to Honora Thompson, widow of James M. Thompson, alias James Mieberg; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. VESTAL: A bill (H. R. 12371) granting a pension to Cora Goddard; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12372) granting a pension to Thanie Thompson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ZIHLMAN: A bill (H. R. 12373) granting a pension to Louisa C. Coleman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin: Petition of members of the First Congregational Church of Janesville, Wis., urging immediate prohibition of the manufacture of alcoholic beverages as a war measure; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ESCH: Petition of members of Henry Dretliott Post, No. 141, Grand Army of the Republic, of Hillsboro, Wis., favoring the Smoot pension bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: Petition of the Chicago Union Ministers' Association, for prohibition of the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquor during the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of J. D. Hollingshead Co., of Chicago, against repeal or postponement of the second-class postage provisions of the war-revenue act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LUNDEEN: Petition of the International Brotherhood of Blacksmiths, Local No. 2, Minneapolis, Minn., Thomas

P. Hughes, secretary, against premium and bonus systems on Government work; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of Boilermakers' Lodge No. 510, Minneapolis, Minn., Dave Swanson, secretary, against premium and bonus systems on Government work; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of Machinists' Union No. 827, Minneapolis, Minn., J. F. Tritz, secretary, against premium and bonus systems on Government work; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of Electrical Workers' Union No. 292, Minneapolis, Minn., Charles A. Anderson, secretary, against premium and bonus systems on Government work; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of Blacksmiths' Union, Local 73, Minneapolis, Minn., A. R. Gisslen, secretary, against premium and bonus systems on Government work; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. McFADDEN: Resolutions passed by Unity Grange, No. 1710, Galilee, Pa., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAKER: Resolution adopted by the Oak Park Baptist Church, Sacramento, Cal., protesting against the zone system and urging its repeal; also letters from the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Sacramento, Cal.; from the Agricultural Extension Club of Nevada County, Cal.; and from the American Federation of Labor, protesting against the zone system and urging its repeal; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolution indorsing the military highway defense system on the Pacific coast adopted by the Mendocino Chamber of Commerce, the Pomeroy (Wash.) Commercial Club, and the Greenwood Civic Club, of Elk, Cal.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SNELL: Petition of members of the Episcopal Church, the Presbyterian Church, the Baptist Church, and the Methodist (Methodist Episcopal) Church, of Gouverneur, N. Y., for the passage of a bill to effectively prohibit the use of any kind of foodstuffs during the war for the manufacture of intoxicating beverages, and to limit liquors on hand to nonbeverage uses; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEENERSON: Petition of the woman's committee of the Minnesota Council of National Defense and Public Safety Commission, in favor of House bills 7736 and 5716; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. VARE: Memorial of the City Councils of Philadelphia, urging the construction of dry docks for commercial shipping at that port; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, June 4, 1918.

(Legislative day of Monday, June 3, 1918.)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Brandegee	Jones, N. Mex.	Nelson	Smith, Mich.
Cummins	Jones, Wash.	Norris	Smoot
Curtis	Kellogg	Page	Sterling
Fall	Kendrick	Penrose	Thompson
Fernald	Kenyon	Poinexter	Townsend
Gronna	King	Ransdell	Wadsworth
Hale	Kirby	Sheppard	Warren
Harding	Lenroot	Shields	Watson
Hardwick	Lodge	Simmons	Wolcott
Hitchcock	McCumber	Smith, Ariz.	
Johnson, Cal.	McNary	Smith, Ga.	
Johnson, S. Dak.	Myers	Smith, Md.	

Mr. CURTIS. I desire to announce the absence of the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN] on official business. I will let this announcement stand for the day.

I wish also to announce the absence of the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. New] on official business. I ask that this announcement may stand for the day.

Mr. KIRBY. I was requested to announce the unavoidable absence of the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. VARDAMAN] on official business.

I wish also to announce that the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BECKHAM] is detained on official business.

Mr. KENDRICK. I desire to announce that the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. HENDERSON] is detained by death in his family.